

THE  
AMERICAN QUARTERLY  
CHURCH REVIEW,  
AND  
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

---

---

VOL. XVIII.

APRIL, 1866.

No. 1.

---

---

ART. I.—PRIEST, ALTAR, AND SACRIFICE.

- (1.) *Brett's Collection of Ancient Liturgies, with a Dissertation, &c.* London : 1720.
- (2.) *Constitutions and Canons of the Holy Apostles.* New York : D. Appleton & Co. 8vo., 1848.
- (3.) *The two Books of Common Prayer, set forth by Authority of Parliament, in the reign of King Edward VI ; Compared with each other.* By EDWARD CARDWELL, D. D., Principal of St. Alban's Hall. Second Edition. 8vo., Oxford University Press, 1851.
- (4.) *The Westminster Assembly's Directory for Public Worship,* 1645 ; and *Baxter's Reformed Liturgy,* 1660.
- (5.) *The Nonjuror's Offices, 1718.—The Scottish Communion Office, 1724-43-55-64.*

HAS the Christian Church a Priesthood, an Altar, and a Sacrifice ? and, if so, in what sense ? In offering a few thoughts to our readers upon this question, we avow in the outset, that we do not write in the spirit of controversy. We confess, too, that it is an inquiry which enters into the very

depths of Christianity, whether viewed as a Supernatural Institution, or as a System of Revealed Truth, or as the living, practical working Body of Christ. There is not a Heresy, ancient or modern, not a duty, private or social, which it does not touch, immediately or remotely. Our object is, to present what we believe to be the Truth of God upon the subject, and especially as bearing upon the present state of theological sentiment in this country, and in the Church.

We take for granted, that there is such an Institution as the Church of God, a Visible Institution, the Church of the Redeemed, a Church essentially One from the first divine interposition after the Fall of Man, to the final surrender of Christ's Mediatorial Throne in the New Jerusalem; One, in the Love which prompted the plan; One, in the Covenant of Mercy, and the purchase of that Covenant, "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;" One, in the great objects of that Covenant, the magnifying of God's perfections, and the salvation of men; One, in the essential characteristics of the faithful in every age.

And yet, while the Church is thus one in all its grand features, the manifestations by which the Plan has been gradually unfolded, have been varied. There was the Ante-diluvian Church, the Church in the days of Noah, the Abrahamic Church, the Mosaic Church, and, last of all, the Christian Church, when the wall of separation was once more broken down. Yet, in each and all these Dispensations, there is one distinguishing characteristic. It is the ever-present Mediatorship of the adorable and ever-blessed Second Person of the Trinity, the Great I AM. In each and all, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by Me." John xiv. 6. As soon as man fell, and Death became his doom, then God in His Mercy interposed. He knew how to contrive a Way by which He could protect every attribute of His character, and every interest of His government, and still save man. Jesus Christ, in the very beginning, was that Way. Then the Plan was instituted, and the promise made, *THE SEED OF THE WOMAN SHALL BRUISE THE SERPENT'S HEAD.* The Plan, even as then revealed, contained in a germ, the whole substance of the Gospel, and was

all that Faith needed on which to rest. Faith did rest upon it. Sacrifice was the great type appointed,—Sacrifice with Blood. Men received it, observed it, and looked for the coming Deliverer. Not only Cain, and Abel, and Noah, and Melchisedek, and Abraham, and the Jews, sacrificed, but all Nations observed the Rite. Everywhere the doctrine of Expiation by Blood was accepted.\* Men had been taught, with more or less distinctness, to find in this Institution an answer to the deep questionings and yearnings of their own spiritual nature. And there was throughout all the East, the ancient home of the highest civilization, a universal looking forward to the coming of One Whom these Sacrifices foreshadowed, and Who thus was the DESIRE OF ALL NATIONS. Job, Balaam, and Abraham, saw Him distinctly. The Magi, who represented the learning and wisdom of the East, knew at once the meaning of the Star which Balaam had already described, and they came, with royal gifts, to worship. Tacitus, and Suetonius, and the Heathen Poets, bear testimony to the universal waiting of the Nations, to what Archbishop Trench calls the “Unconscious Prophecy of Heathendom.”

Now, as to the origin of this Institution, Sacrifice with Blood, there is but one explanation. Mere human philosophy never has shown, and never can show, that there is any *natural* connection between Sacrifices with Blood, and the Forgiveness of Sin. The mystery, so deep that angels cannot fathom it, is only so far solved now, and for us, in that we are pointed to Him Who was, and is, “the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;” the Great High Priest; Himself both the Priest and the Sacrifice; “Who offered Himself without spot to God;” (Heb. ix. 14;) and Who, “after he had offered one Sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God.” (Heb. x. 12.) But what the exact nature of that Sacrifice was, philosophy knows as little now, as Abel, and Abraham knew; though Schisms and Heresies, and blasphemies, almost innumerable, ancient and modern, have been, and still are, the

---

\* For full proof of the universal prevalence of Sacrifices with Blood, see Magee's Discourses on Atonement and Sacrifice, pp. 67—84.

fruit of the ceaseless attempt to be wise above what is written. Hence, we have Calvinism, and Socinianism, and the other modern *isms*, down to Bushnellism.

But besides this great Sin-Offering, there have always been required Offerings of another character ; Sacrifices, not to take away sin ; Sacrifices made acceptable to God through the all-sufficient merits of the One great Sin-Offering. It is a great mistake, and yet a common one, to suppose that the word Sacrifice always and of necessity denotes a bloody or propitiatory Offering for Sin. On the contrary, the Hebrew word *minchah*, signifying Sacrifice, and the Greek word *thusia*, *thusia*, by which the Seventy translated the Hebrew word in more than a hundred instances, denote Offerings in general, whether Bloody or Unbloody, whether for Sin, or of Praise and Thanksgiving.

This kind of offering, too, is universal. It proves itself, by such acceptance, to accord with the instincts and sentiments of men, at all times, in all places, and under every variety of circumstances, and every shade of civilization. And, as everything offered up to God is a Sacrifice, in the true and proper sense of the term, so a Sacrifice implies an Altar and a Priesthood. In this perpetual Order of Priesthood,—an Order in its origin antedating the Priesthood of Levi and of Abraham,—an Order unchanged in its essential features in all these succeeding Dispensations, and so “having neither beginning of days nor end of life,”—we see a perpetual type of the Great High Priest, Jesus Christ. Here, too, we understand the meaning of the inspired Psalmist, in that wonderful Messianic prediction, “The Lord sware, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest forever, after the Order of Melchisedek.”

This conception of Sacrifice, as an elementary principle of all Religion, as entering, of necessity, into the very nature of Worship, belongs also to Christianity.

The prophet Malachi, ere he closes the sacred record of the old Dispensation, declares, in that sublime passage :—

“From the rising of the sun, even to the going down of the same, My name shall be great among the Gentiles ; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My name and a pure offering ; for My name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts.” Mal. i. 2.



As the Septuagint was in the hands of our Saviour and His Apostles, and was by them in constant use, so its language, or term signifying Sacrifice, was frequently applied to various acts of Christian Worship and devotion, by the inspired writers of the New Testament. To the Hebrews, the Apostle writes :—

“By Him, therefore, let us offer the *Sacrifice*, *θυσίαν* *thusian* of praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name.” Heb. xiii. 5.

“We have an Altar; whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle, \* \* \* by Him, therefore let us offer the *Sacrifice Thusian*, of praise to God continually; that is the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name.” Heb. xiii. 10, 15.

The word Sacrifice is also applied to *good works*, and especially to *deeds of charity* :—

“To do good and to communicate, forget not, for with such *Sacrifices Thusians*, God is well pleased.” Heb. xiii. 16.

The term Sacrifice is also applied to the act of self-dedication to God. St. Paul, thoroughly imbued with the spirit of both the Old and New Dispensations, said :—

“I beseech you, therefore, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a *living Sacrifice*, *thusian zosan*, holy, and acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service.” (Rom. xii. 1.)

To the Corinthians he wrote :—

“Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s Table, and the table of devils.” (1 Cor. x. 21.)

Language which, of necessity, involves the whole idea of Altar, Priest and Sacrifice, and is a mere quibble or play upon words under any other interpretation.

To Cornelius the Angel of God said, in a vision :—

“Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God.” (Acts x. 4.)

The Sacrificial character of Prayer is more distinctly declared by the Apostle St. John, in his vision; when the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, the Root of David, came and took the book, and—

"The four beasts and four and twenty elders, fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials, full of odors, which are the prayers of saints." (Rev. v. 5, 8.)

And, after this,—

"Another Angel came and stood at the Altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints, upon the golden Altar, which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God, out of the Angel's hand." (Rev. viii. 3 and 4.)

St. Peter also declares, distinctly, that the Offering of Sacrifice is a feature of the Christian Dispensation. To the Jews, scattered abroad, he says:—

"Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot; Who verily was *pre-ordained before the foundation of the world*, but was manifested in these last times for you. \* \* \* To Whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious. Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an Holy Priesthood, to offer up Spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ." 1st Pet. i. 18-20, and II. 4 and 5.

We have testimony stronger even than all this. One greater than St. Paul, and St. Peter, and St. John, said:—

"Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, *Thusiasterion* and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the Altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." St. Matt. v. 23, 24.

The whole Psalter, which the Blessed Saviour constantly used, and commended to the employment of His Church, is full, throughout, of this idea of Priest, Altar and Sacrifice.

Such, in brief, is the argument, that Sacrifice belongs to the Christian Church. Indeed, as self-sacrifice to God is a fundamental principle in all true Religion with all orders of moral beings, so self-sacrifice to God, *through Jesus Christ*, is the cardinal element of the Christian Religion, and is both the law and the measure of the Christian Life. How this great rule differs from the first axiom of modern New England Theology,—to wit: that Man's happiness is his ruling motive, and that he serves God in preference to serving the devil, be-

cause it "pays,"—we shall not stop to discuss. But it does differ completely. The two Systems are wide apart as Heaven and Earth. Sacrifice, as an idea, a principle, a duty, runs throughout the whole System of Christianity. The entire abnegation of self, and the complete surrender of one's whole being, body and soul, to Christ, is the essential characteristic of the Christian. "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life, for my sake, shall find it." St. Matt. x. 39. Alms, prayer, praise, confession, intercession; self-denial of ease, pleasure, honor, position; the enduring of affliction, hardship, reproach, persecution, if need be,—all this, as an Offering to God, and acceptable to Him through Jesus Christ, hath the true nature of a Sacrifice.

Practically, the principle is one of unspeakable value and importance. See how it hallows and dignifies the lowliest and most revolting duties; how it sweetens the bitterest cup; how it intensifies faith, and gives importunity to prayer; how it nerves and animates the private Christian, the Minister, and the Missionary, with the boldness of a martyr spirit; how it is the surety of success, and of final victory, even amid apparent failure,—to feel and know that all this is a Sacrifice well pleasing to God. Without this solace, the Christian may submit uncomplainingly to hardship, and trial, because God lays the heavy load upon him. But how differently the burden seems, when he may feel, that he thus knows what is meant by "the fellowship of Christ's sufferings," and that he is thus identified with Him in all His earthly life, of toil and ignominy and sacrifice now, and that he shall be identified with Him in the glory which awaits His mystical Body hereafter. None can read the Earlier Christian Fathers, without being struck with the constant presence of this vital truth, their deep consciousness of the perfect oneness of the Christian with Christ in His Mystical Body, the Church; nor can he fail to note the striking contrast to all this, in the teachings of our superficial modern theology. And yet, Sacrifice, in all its forms, as we have said again and again, is acceptable to God alone through the One great Atoning Sacrifice of the Cross.

Now, if there be this Sacrificial character in Christian Wor-

ship,—and this is the point to which we come,—and if there be, in the Christian Church, an Order of men specially called, appointed, and ordained to appear before God, and offer up to Him the Sacrifices of Christian hearts, then that Order of men is a Priesthood ; and that on which such an Offering is made to God, is an Altar ; not figuratively, but as truly, as that the Worship offered is a true and proper Worship.

We come now to a question, which, for many reasons, is of special importance ; it is, indeed, one of the great doctrinal questions of our day. In what respects is the Holy Sacrament of the Supper, a Sacrifice ? We propose to meet this inquiry, briefly, but frankly ; because it is one of those points on which the Romish Church has departed most widely from the Primitive Church, and because, in our revulsion from Romanism, we are in danger of rushing to the opposite extreme, and ignoring all true conception of Sacrifice, of any sort or nature, in connection with the Holy Eucharist.

In the first place, there is, in the Service of the Holy Eucharist, a three-fold Sacrifice ; first, “of our alms ;” next, “of praise and thanksgiving ;” and then, “of ourselves, and souls, and bodies.” Each and all of these, the Church declares to be an Offering to God, and so, in their very nature, a Sacrifice. Even John Calvin says, a Sacrifice is whatever is solemnly offered to God ; *quicquid omnino Deo offertur*.

But there is another part of the Eucharistic Service, characterized by Sacrifice. It is the Oblation of the Bread and Wine to God. The very word, Oblation or Offering, of necessity implies Sacrifice, or something made holy, or consecrate to God. Here is the language of that Oblation :—

“Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and *make here, before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make* ; having in remembrance His blessed passion and precious death, His mighty resurrection and glorious ascension ; rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.”

This language is as plain as it can be. There is here an Offering, an Oblation, a Sacrifice. It is not an Expiatory Sac-

rifice ; but a memorial or commemorative Sacrifice before God, offered up to Him, whereby the Church pleads before Him the all-atoning Sacrifice of the Cross ; and with the prayer, that, by the Holy Spirit, He will make the Sacrifice a Sacrament, even the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is first offered as Sacrifice to God, with the prayer that He will make it a Sacrament to us :—

“ We most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us ; and of Thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these Thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood. And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept *this, our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving* ; humbly beseeching thee to grant that, by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we, and all Thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion.”

This characteristic feature of the Eucharistic Service is thoroughly Scriptural and Primitive. At the time of the institution of this Holy Sacrament, when at the Paschal Supper Jesus Christ offered himself to God, as the true Paschal Lamb—and that He did thus offer Himself, the whole argument in the Epistle to the Hebrews goes to prove—all the words of our Lord, which He then used, are not recorded. And yet, the sacred record, even as given, (1 Cor. xi. 23–5,) clearly teaches or implies all that we have said as to the nature of this Sacrament.\* We have already seen that the *idea* of Altar and Sacrifice pervades the Scriptures of the New Testament. So, also, we find it everywhere in the writings of the Church in the age immediately succeeding the Apostles. The Second of the Apostolical Canons, says :—

“ If any Bishop or Priest offer anything in the Sacrifice at the Altar, beside what the Lord hath commanded, &c.”

Justin Martyr, who wrote only about fifty years after the

---

\* See Brett’s Dissertation on the Principal Liturgies, &c., p. 106. London: 1720. Also, Bishop Seabury’s Sermon Of the Holy Eucharist. Seabury’s Sermons, Vol. I. pp. 144–162.

death of St. John, calls the gifts of Bread and Wine an Offering, *προσφορά* and also a Sacrifice. *θυσια*.\* He says :—

“That the Sacrifices of Christians are supplications and giving of thanks; and that these are the only Sacrifices which Christians have been taught they should perform, in that thankful remembrance of their food, both dry and liquid, wherein is also commemorated the Passion which the Son of God suffered by Himself.”

St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, three times uses the term, Altar, in his Epistles to the Philadelphians, Trallians and Ephesians. To the former he writes :—

“For there is but one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup in the Unity of His Blood; one Altar, as there is also one Bishop, together with the Presbytery and Deacons.”†

So also Origen, a little later, uses similar language. These, be it remembered, were all authorities of the Ante-Nicene age, when the Church was as yet in her purity, to which age we look for exact statements of Faith, Discipline and Worship, before they had become corrupted. Hagenbach says :—

“In the Apostolical Fathers, and with more definite reference to the Lord's Supper in the writings of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, the idea of a Sacrifice already occurs; by which, however, they did not understand a daily repeated propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ, (in the sense of the Romish Church;) but a thank-offering to be presented in Christians themselves. \* \* \* Justin Martyr calls the Lord's Supper *θυσια*, *Sacrifice*, and *προσφορά* *Offering*, and compares it with the Sacrifice under the Old Testament Dispensation.”‡

Dr. Jarvis says :—

“The Eucharist is the voluntary, but not the piacular Sacrifice of the Christian Church, perpetually praising the adorable mercies of our blessed Redeemer, and forever thanking Him for that one Oblation of Himself, once offered, by which He “blotted out the hand-writing of ordinances,” by which we were condemned, ‘and took it out of the way, nailing it to His Cross.’ Col. ii. 14. This was the sense in which the ancient Church regarded the Eucharist as a Sacrifice; and, if necessary, I might quote all the great writers, from the Apostolic age to the close of the fifth century, speaking of it as the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, but never as piacular or expiatory in itself.”§

\* *Dia cum Tryphon.* c. 117.

† *Ep. to Philadelphians*, Sec. 4.

‡ *History of Doctrines*, Vol. I., pp. 204, 210.

§ *Jarvis' Reply to Milner's End of Controversy*, pp. 166-7.

Bishop Bull, writing against the Romish doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and so using guarded language, makes the following statement ;—

“It is true, the Eucharist is frequently called by the Ancient Fathers an Oblation, a Sacrifice ; but it is also to be remembered that they say also, it is a ‘Reasonable Sacrifice, a Sacrifice without Blood.’ \* \* \* In the Holy Eucharist, we set before God Bread and Wine, as figures or images of the precious Blood of Christ shed for us, and of His precious Body, and plead to God the merit of His Son’s Sacrifice, once offered on the Cross for us sinners, and in this Sacrament represented, beseeching Him, for the sake thereof to bestow His heavenly blessing on us. \* \* \* The Eucharistic Sacrifice, thus explained, is indeed, a ‘Reasonable Sacrifice,’ widely different from that monstrous Sacrifice of the Mass, taught in the Church of Rome.”\*

This feature of Oblation or Offering is found in all the most Ancient Liturgies of the Church. We are aware, that in respect to the Doctrine of the Early Church, little reliance can be placed on most of the Liturgies which have come down to us ; simply because we are compelled to receive them only in the dress which they have, as a matter of course, assumed, in all those ages of acknowledged corruption through which they have passed. Still, the appeal to them, when properly guarded, has great weight.† And the point to be specially noted is, that in all these Ancient Liturgies, this characteristic of the Eucharist is clearly marked. The Oblation of the Elements has the full force of the unanswerable argument, Antiquity, Universality, and Consent.

The Liturgy of St. James, used in the Church of Jerusalem, the first Christian Church, is as follows :—

“We sinners offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice, beseeching Thee not to deal with us after our sins, &c., &c. Send down, O Lord, this Thy most Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these holy Gifts here set before Thee, that by His holy, good, and glorious Presence, He may sanctify and make the Bread the Holy Body of Thy Christ, and this Cup, the precious Blood of Thy Christ.”

\* Bishop Bull’s Answer to the Bishop of Meaux, Voll II. p. 251. See also Joseph Mede’s Works, Book II., ch. vii., London, 1672.

† The fullest and we believe the only complete collection of the Ancient Liturgies, is that of Asseman, a copy of which is in the Library of the General Theological Seminary.



The language of this Liturgy is the more important from its great antiquity, which has never been called in question. One of its Prayers makes supplication for that Church as "*glorious Zion, the Mother of all Churches.*"

The Clementine Liturgy, also of unquestionable antiquity, and preserved in the Apostolical Constitutions, (Book viii. ch. 12,) is as follows. The Rubric says :—

"When this is done, let the Deacons bring the Gifts to the Bishop at the Altar; and let the Priests stand on his right hand and on his left, as disciples by their master."

In the Prayer of Consecration is the following :—

"We Offer to Thee, our King and our God, according to His Institution, this Bread and this Cup; giving thanks to Thee through Him, that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee, and to Sacrifice unto Thee. And we beseech Thee that Thou wilt look graciously on these Gifts now lying before Thee, O Thou self-sufficient God, and accept them to the honor of Thy Christ; and send down Thy Holy Spirit, the Witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, on this Sacrifice, that He may make this Bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of Thy Christ."

St Mark's Liturgy, used in the Church at Alexandria, is as follows. The reference to the prophecy of Malachi is unmistakable :—

"Wherefore, giving thanks through Him, to Thee, together with Him and the Holy Ghost, we offer this reasonable and unbloody Worship, which is offered to Thee by all nations, from the rising to the setting of the sun; from the North unto the South. For thy Name is great among all Nations, and in every place, Incense, Sacrifice and Oblations, are offered to it." \* \* \* "Send down Thine Holy Spirit, upon us, and upon these Loaves, and these Cups, that the Almighty God may sanctify and thoroughly consecrate them, making the Bread the Body, and the Cup the Blood of the New Testament of our Lord Himself, our God, our Saviour, and Supreme King, Jesus Christ."

The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, used in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, has the following :—

"Through all, and in all things, we offer to Thee, thine Own, out of Thine Own gifts. We offer to Thee this reasonable and unbloody Worship, and beg, pray, beseech Thee, to send down Thine Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Gifts lying before Thee. Make this Bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and what is in this Cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ."

The English Church, at the Reformation, retained this feature of the Eucharist in her Liturgy. In the First Prayer Book of King Edward VI., the language is :—

“Wherefore, O Lord, and Heavenly Father, according to the Institution of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here, before Thy divine Majesty, with these Thy Holy Gifts, the Memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make.”

In arranging this Eucharistic Office, the Reformers had before them, as their guide, the most Ancient Liturgies. The principle of Oblation to God was clearly recognized. The old Reformer, Ridley, says :—

“The whole substance of our Sacrifice, which is frequented of the Church in the Lord’s Supper, consisteth in Prayers, Praise and giving of thanks, and in remembering and showing forth of that Sacrifice upon the Altar of the Cross, that the same might continually be had in reverence by mystery, which, once only and no more, was offered as the price of our redemption.” \* \* “The Priest doth offer an unbloody Sacrifice, if it be rightly understood. \* \* \* It is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner, and in a mystery, and as a representation of that bloody Sacrifice.” Parker Society Publications, pp. 211, 250.

The same doctrine is preserved in the Scotch Liturgy. Unfortunately, however, in the Second Liturgy of Edward VI., the influence of John Calvin and his disciples, Martin Bueer, and Peter Martyr, was strong enough in the English Church to expunge it ; and, as Whateley says, “the most Ancient Forms and primitive Rites were forced to give way to modern fancies.” The better Class of English Churchmen contend that it is not a serious, certainly not a fatal omission, inasmuch as the Prayer of Oblation, (or rather what is left of it,) is transferred to the Post-Communion Service, where it is still used after the elements have been already distributed and consumed ! If they are satisfied with such an explanation, we surely will not complain. But we esteem it a special mercy to the American Church, and one fully recompensing for the long delay in gaining the Episcopate, that we derived not only our Ministerial Orders, but our Liturgy also, in this its great and most marked feature, from the Primitive and Catholic

Ritual of the Scotch Church, which, in this respect, is in full harmony with Scriptural and Apostolic times. Thus, in our Prayer Book, the Offering of the Elements to God is called an Oblation, or Sacrifice. The language of the Office is,—

“Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make.”

In our Office for the Institution of Ministers, the Priestly character of the Christian Ministry is taught as plainly as it can be. The Bishop's Letter of Institution says :—

“We do fully confide our license and authority, to perform the Office of a Priest in the Parish [or Church] of E. And also do hereby institute you into said Parish, [or Church,] possessed of full power to perform every act of Sacerdotal function among the people of the same.”

So also, it is said, “The Lord hath ordained that they who serve at the Altar should live of the things belonging to the Altar.” The expressions “Sacerdotal function,” “Sacerdotal relation,” “standing on the right and left of the Altar,” are used. And among the Prayers to be offered by the Institutor, is the following :—

“O Holy Jesus, who hast purchased to Thyself an universal Church, and hast promised to be with the Ministers of Apostolic succession to the end of the world; be graciously pleased to bless the ministry and service of him who is now appointed to offer the Sacrifices of prayer and praise to Thee in this house which is called by Thy Name.”

That the doctrine of Priest, Altar and Sacrifice is therefore the doctrine of the American Church, admits of no dispute. What the nature is of this Priesthood, Altar and Sacrifice, we think enough has been said to show. Archbishop Bramhall, in his defence of the English Reformed Church against the Romish Bishop of Chalcedon, thus clearly defines this doctrine :

“We acknowledge an Ecclesiastical Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; a commemorative Sacrifice, or a memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross; a representative Sacrifice, or a representation of the Passion of Christ before the eyes of His Heavenly Father; an impetrative Sacrifice, or an impetration of the fruit and benefit of His Passion, by

way of real prayer; and, lastly, an applicative Sacrifice, or an application of His merits unto our souls."<sup>\*</sup>

We reach, now, another important point in this examination. At what precise period in the history of the Church the true conception of Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist was lost sight of, we shall not inquire. It is with the fact itself that we are now concerned, that the primitive doctrine of a Memorial Commemorative Sacrifice offered to God, with the Prayer that it may be made a Sacrament to us, gave place to the doctrine of the Offering of Christ's Body and Blood really upon the Altar, as a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead; a doctrine, as Bingham says, "no ancient author or Ritual ever mentions.† Then, at length, came the doctrine of Transubstantiation; and, at last, that culmination of error and blasphemy, the Canons of the Council of Trent.

"*Canon I.*—If any shall say that in the Mass there is not offered to God a true and proper Sacrifice, or that what is offered is nothing else than that Christ is given us to eat, *let him be accursed.*"

"*Canon II.*—If any shall say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice which was made upon the Cross, but not propitiatory; or, that it only profits him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, pains, and satisfactions, and other necessities, *let him be accursed.*"

"*Canon V.*—If any shall say that to celebrate Masses *in honor of the saints*, and to obtain *their intercession with God*, as the Church intends, is an imposture, *let him be accursed.*"‡.

The effect of this change, as to the nature of the Holy Eucharist, words cannot measure or describe. It destroys the Sacrament. It changes the whole character of the Christian Priesthood. It robs Christ of His honor, and His Cross of its efficacy. It contradicts the plainest testimony of Holy Scripture; wherein we are taught that Christ "entered in once into the Holy Place;" (Heb. ix. 12.) "Now, once in the end of the world, hath He appeared to put away sin by the Sacrifice of Himself." (Heb. ix. 26.) "We are sanctified through the

---

<sup>\*</sup> Bramhall's Works, Vol. II., p. 276.

† Bingham's Antiquities, Book II., Ch. xix. Sect. 15.

‡ Council of Trent, 22d Session, A. D., 1562.

Offering of the Body of Jesus Christ once for all." (Heb. x. 10.) "After He had offered one Sacrifice for sins, forever sat down at the right hand of God." (Heb. x. 12.) "There is no more Offering for sin." (Heb. x. 18.)

The effect of this corrupting the Faith, in so vital a principle, on the law of individual Christian life and growth, is equally disastrous. It sinks the Eucharistic Sacrifice into a mummery, a show. It loses sight of the voluntariness of love, and faith, and obedience. With its *opus operatum* theory of the Sacrifice of the Mass, on which Christians are to gaze, rather than to receive the Sacrament in penitence, faith and love, it does not, and cannot develop, elevate and strengthen the inner life of the believer. Our XXXI Article defines the true doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and characterizes the Romish corruption of that doctrine, as follows :—

"The Offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none *other* satisfaction for sin but *that alone*. Wherefore the Sacrifice of Masses, in which it was commonly said, that *the Priest did offer Christ* for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were *blasphemous fables* and dangerous deceits."

We take no note, now, of Socinian cavils, or Infidel sneers, or the subterfuges of the modern School of critics; all of whom wrestle perpetually against that great doctrine which is the death-blow to human pride, Man's Fall in Adam, and his recovery in Christ. Here is the true secret of the ceaseless hostility of this School of Critics, ancient and modern, to Miracles, Inspiration, and especially to the Mosaic record. It is not because such a man as Colenso is a scholar, that he quarrels with the story of the Fall of Man, and with Messianic Prophecy,—for he has shown himself as wanting in sound scholarship, as he is in conscientious regard for his own solemn oaths, and in that manly honesty which even the world has a right to look for in a standard-bearer of any sort. No. No. The real difficulty does not lie in Geological strata, and the "discrepances" of the inspired page. It lies in the obdurate Pride and stubborn conceited Self-Will of the human heart; which will believe everything, however silly and ridiculous, which will

suffer everything, however bitter and painful, which will do everything, however toilsome, rather than humble itself, and bow like a little child at the foot of the Cross, and receive mercy as a sinner. Socinianism, which denies all Atonement, and Romanism, which dares try to make an Atonement for itself, are only different phases of the same thing. The two Systems are not greatly unlike ; as their mutual sympathies and common hatreds so often show. And hence, in Boston and elsewhere, conversions from one of these to the other, are far more readily made than to the Church.

The point now distinctly before us is, that there was that in the Sacrifice on the Cross, by which, in its very nature, it stands, and will forever stand, alone. It admits of no degree, no supplement, no perpetuation, no repetition. For it, all that preceded was but typical, indicative, preparatory. All that succeeded, was, and is, but to distribute its blessings, and secure its trophied ends. The Cross, nothing but the Cross, is the one symbol of Man's Redemption. When the Blessed Saviour said, "*for this cause came I unto this hour ;*" when He prayed, "Father, if Thou be willing, remove *this Cup* from Me ;" when, "being in an agony, He prayed more earnestly, and His sweat was as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground ;" when He cried with a loud voice "IT IS FINISHED," and bowed His head in death ; then, there, and thus, it was that "He hath appeared to put away sin by the Sacrifice of Himself." Then and there was paid the price of what He calls "THE NEW TESTAMENT IN MY BLOOD." We do not mean that Christ's Incarnation, His life, His Resurrection, His Ascension, His perpetual Intercession, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, are not all essential parts of one great scheme ; but we do mean, that the Cross is a Central, Cardinal, vitalizing feature of the Gospel, equally removed from the speculations of Rationalism and Humanitarianism on the one hand, and from the equally impious presumption of Romanism on the other ; both which rob the Cross of its power and glory.

The Church, the true Church, leads her child personally and directly to the Cross. She bids him, in penitence and faith, behold the LAMB OF GOD bleeding and dying upon it to take

away the sins of the world. She baptizes him into Christ for the remission of his sins, and for the spiritual sustenance wherewith she feeds him in the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. She bids him ever follow Christ's perfect example. She calls him to join in the perpetual Worship, the Eucharistic Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving; and so she fits him for that sublime Worship which St. John saw in beatific vision. This is the doctrine of our own branch of the Church. This is the doctrine of the Primitive Church. All that is truly subjective in the Christian life and character; all that can address a living consciousness, and guide and strengthen the individual conscience, and train and sanctify the intellect and heart, and develop the graces and virtues of the Christian character, is secured; while all that Christ hath ordained which is positive and objective, and suited to our two-fold nature, is received and observed.

The Church of Rome, however, steps in between her child and the Cross. She will not, dare not, let him look, with a personal faith, upon the bleeding, suffering, dying Saviour. She claims herself to offer Christ afresh on the Cross, as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead. She bids her child have faith in her, ever repeating, supplementing, perpetuating, Christ's "finished" work. She annihilates and ignores the individuality and authority of consciousness and conscience. She meets their remonstrances with curses and threats. And then, she has her scale of prices for all this; and so, with her chaffering of souls, she fills her exchequer, while she holds her child spell-bound to herself, by playing upon his fears and his imagination, with her sceptre and her wand, her power and her sorcery. What there is in all this to elevate Humanity, what there is of the power, and beauty, and symmetry of the Christian life, let her past and present record show, in all the nations where the experiment has been fairly and fully made.

So intense has been the abhorrence of this Romish error, so deep the conviction that it vitiates Christianity itself, at its most vital point,—for around the Cross the whole Gospel centres, as the grand luminous fountain of Life and Light,—that multi-



tudes of modern Christians, and not a few Churchmen, have hesitated to employ the terms, Priest, Altar and Sacrifice ; except in connection with Him, "the Lamb of God Who takest away the sins of the world." Yet many of the noblest and truest of the English Reformers have felt the importance of the principle involved, and have spoken and written accordingly ; and not a few of the more moderate of our own Church, like the late Bishop Henshaw, have contended earnestly for the great truth, of a Priesthood, an Altar and a Sacrifice, in the Church of Christ.\*

The Church should not, because of the Romish corruption and perversion of a doctrine, give up the doctrine itself, and so, in her revulsion from Rome, rush to an extreme where she can no longer be in harmony with the Church in its purest days, nor be such a Church as the human heart instinctively craves. This would be folly and madness. Let her rather cherish a doctrine which hallows and clothes her Worship with such sublime significance, making it an image of the Worship of the Heavenly Hosts, and which such multitudes of the saintliest on earth have found to be a doctrine of unspeakable comfort and blessing. Let a sound sentiment pervade the Church on this subject, and we shall no longer be compelled to witness such a shameful profanation of sacred things, as now too often exists ; where the holy vessels are but a symbol of stinginess and slovenliness ; and the Holy Table is made a convenient receptacle for hats and umbrellas, and secular books and newspapers, and is appropriated to other equally unhallowed and disgraceful uses.

---

\* Bishop White's objection to the terms Priest, Altar, and Sacrifice, in the Christian Church, is based upon the *assumption* that the Greek word *θυσια* *Thusia*, by which the Seventy translated the Hebrew word signifying Sacrifice, always denotes an animal, bloody, propitiatory Sacrifice. His whole argument hinges upon this point. Yet in this, he is certainly mistaken ; a mistake which he subsequently frankly admitted. See Dr. Wilson's *Memoirs of Bishop White*, p. 378. In both the Septuagint, and in the writings of the New Testament, the word is often used to denote Unbloody Sacrifices. Even Bishop White acknowledges that the Sacrament is a Commemoration of an Atonement made once for all ; that there is an "Oblation in that Ordinance ;" "the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist are an appointed Memorial of the Body and Blood of Christ," "in which we offer them to the Father as typical of His Blessed Son's Body and Blood." He here yields everything which we claim.

It is not to be forgotten, however, that this fatal error, this distinguishing feature of Romish corruption, this change of a Commemorative Sacrifice and a Sacrament into the Expiatory and Atoning Sacrifice of the Cross, is one of those points of Doctrine where our late perverts to Rome first gave clear token of their apostacy. Newman, and Ives, and that whole class of men, at an early period in their downfall, began to use language concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and especially the REAL PRESENCE, which was un-Scriptural, anti-Primitive, and essentially Romish.\* The two Systems, of Doctrine, and of Worship based upon that Doctrine, are thoroughly antagonistic, and men cannot long remain in one System, while they yet hold all that is characteristic and distinctive in the other.

In this connection it should be noted, that some of the Ultra-Ritualists of the English Church, at the present day, have most certainly given up the Catholic view of the Eucharist, in exchange for the Romish interpretation. As the writings of this class of men are likely enough to exert some influence in the American Church, this feature of modern ultraism is worth noting. Thus in the *Directorium Anglicanum*, noticed in our last Number, we find the nature of the Holy Eucharist thus defined :—

“Even the Calvinist will concede the Liturgy to be an Act, and not a bare form of Prayer. But the Catholic priest, *who knows that this action is done in the Person of Christ, who knows his office to be to perpetuate on the altars of the Church Militant on earth the same Sacrifice which the Great High Priest consummated once on the Cross, and perpetuates, not repeats*, before the mercy-seat in Heaven, will reverently handle such tremendous mysteries, will be greatly careful that no dishonor be thoughtlessly done unto His Lord, Who vouchsafes to be present on our altars.”

---

\* We do not, of course, discuss now the doctrine of the Real Presence. Let it suffice to say, that both the two opposite errors, the Romish, which leads to superstition, and the Zwinglian, which leads to irreverent contempt, sprung from an attempt to define what has never been revealed, the nature of that Presence. Both these definitions destroy the nature of the Sacrament. The Early Church, before the spirit of philosophy crept in, simply believed that to the faithful are given, and by them are received, the Body and Blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. With this they were content. Our blessed Lord, when He was charged with giving “His flesh to Eat,” as He did not in the slightest degree qualify His language, but, rather intensified it, so neither did He explain it. (St. John, vi. 51-8.) Hence, all such expressions as “objective” Presence, are to be avoided, as unauthorized, and tending to evil.

A late writer in the *Union Review*, speaks of—

"The Sacrifice of Calvary, perpetuated sacramentally in the Sacrifice of the altar." \* \* \* "The leading minds in our midst have been led to discern the true nature of Catholic worship, for the first time for three hundred years; the absolute necessity, if we would have a communicant people, of encouraging all from early childhood to worship the Lamb in His redeeming love, to go with their Lord to Calvary, to see *Him lifted up in the sanctuary to receive their adoring homage.*" \* \* \* "First and foremost, the doctrine of the Perpetual Sacrifice must be proclaimed."

Again :—

"The Ritual of Heaven is objective, and the principal worship of the Church is equally so, by reason of its being identical with the Normal and Apocalyptic ritual, and thus containing a great action, even the *perpetuation of the Sacrifice made upon the Cross*, in an unbloody manner on the altar."

A little work has lately been published in London, by this class of men, entitled, "A Manual of Devotions and Directions for Members of the Church of England, when attending the Service of the Divine Liturgy without Communicating." It is a curious index of doctrinal views. Much of the Ceremonialism which it recognizes and describes, such as processions, frequent bowings, and genuflections, and crossings, is in close harmony with the Romish, but not with the truly Catholic Church. In "the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant," when the Priest comes to the words, "We also bless Thy holy name for all persons departed this life," etc., the Priest makes a pause, during the interval of which, the manual directs the young worshipper to say, "Grant them Thine eternal rest, O Lord, especially those departed this life for whom my prayers are desired." But this is not the point now before us. At the Prayer of Consecration of the Elements, the following words of devotion are put into the mouths of the worshippers :—

"And now, O Jesus, Thou art really coming to visit us. Thou art really coming to thy Altar. *Thou art really going to be offered up in Sacrifice to the Father.* Now, O my soul, see how the heavens are opening, how the angels of God are descending upon our Altar, and surrounding it. See how they are bending and prostrating themselves before it; for they know that Jesus is about to come upon our Altar, and make it His throne. Eternal Father, we offer unto Thee this Al-

mighty, Immaculate, and Adorable Sacrifice. Behold the Almighty Victim lying there."

At the conclusion of the ceremony, the worshipper finally exclaims.—

"All is over. *The Sacrifice of the Lamb is complete.* We are redeemed to God, through His blood. Alleluia," etc.

No one can deny, in studying carefully this little Manual, that according to these men, the Priest does, really and truly, offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass, in the literal Romish sense of that term.

To show the extent to which Ceremonialism is carried, we give an account of the manner in which the Order of St. Benedict celebrated last Good Friday:—

"The Chapel was hung with black, and all daylight was carefully excluded, but two large candles glimmered before the altar. After a few seconds, however, it was apparent that a procession was advancing, at a snail's pace, through the gloom, and threading its way carefully, through a rather numerous and closely-packed congregation, principally of the poorer class. Brother Ignatius wore a cloak of gold vestment on his back, while his head was covered with the cowl of the order. The Rev. G. J. Ouseley closed the procession, wearing a vestment of black, with a large white cross on the back. The monks, pure and simple, wore only their ordinary black dresses and cowls. Brother Ignatius had carried in the procession what appeared to be a small coffin, draped with black, and surrounded by a crown of thorns."

"At the words, 'It is finished,' and 'He bowed His head and gave up the ghost,' an attempt was made to portray the lightning and thunder which the Scripture narratives record to have attended the real event. Brother Ignatius, Mr. Ouseley, all the monks, and most of the congregation, prostrated themselves for a few seconds. Brother Ignatius then completed the reading, or rather the singing of the gospel, after which, various collects or prayers followed, each being preceded by the formula, 'Let us pray,' 'Let us kneel down,' 'Let us rise up again,' the effect being that Brother Ignatius, Mr. Ouseley, the monks, and the faithful, were continually rising and falling, and falling and rising, although they were standing when the prayers were read." "The crape was then further removed, the crucifix again held aloft, and the words, 'Behold the wood of the cross,' repeated with the same response. Then the crape was entirely removed, and the figure of the Saviour was exposed, Mr. Ouseley saying, 'Behold the wood of the holy cross, on which hung the salvation of the world.' The response having been sung, the crucifix was lowered to the ground, and Brother Ignatius, creeping towards it, reverentially kissed it. Mr. Ouseley,

taking off his cross-embroidered vestment, followed his example. Brother Ignatius then said, that 'in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,' he desired to say a few words to the congregation, whom he addressed as 'men and women, sons and daughters of our fallen race.' He accordingly ascended a kind of pulpit, and in a tone of impassioned entreaty, besought all present to show their love for Jesus by coming to adore His holy cross. They kissed, he said, the pictures of relatives and distant friends, why not kiss the emblem of their faith, the cross of their Lord? He then prescribed that, during the 'creeping,' a hymn should be sung, that the faithful, in drawing near the altar, should make three prostrations, and finally, that they should kiss the hands and feet of the figure on the crucifix."

Now, taking the Romish view of the Sacrifice of the Mass, all this is in full keeping. If we were to really believe, as Romanists do believe, that the Priest re-enacts, actually and truly, the stupendous tragedy of Calvary, that he perpetuates or repeats what Christ "finished," no possible degree of awe, or method of its manifestation, would seem out of place. Not only the "creeping" of these Benedictines, but the quaking earth, the rending rocks, the opened graves, the darkened heavens, might well give forth their language of horror. But, most assuredly, this would not be that most comfortable Sacrament to which the Holy Scripture, the Primitive Church, and our own, invite us, and which we are bid approach and receive, with deepest penitence and humility, yet with the voice of praise and thanksgiving. The *Christian Remembrancer*, for Jan., 1865, has the following :—

"It is far from our wish to counsel any timid repudiation of Ritualism. It is because we believe that Ritualism is the natural law of the English Church's worship, and because we believe that Englishmen are coming round to that conviction far more extensively and far more completely than we could have thought possible some years since, that we regret the blindness of those who would drive back this happy tendency, by over-laying the legitimate Ritual of our Church with a mass of startling observances, which, to the common mind, speak of nothing but Rome."

Archdeacon Denison, speaking of these extreme Ritualists, said :—

"He had the utmost regard and respect for many of those who differed from him on the subject, because he knew that among them

there were many of the most pains-taking and hard-working of God's Ministers, and therefore he desired to deal with the subject tenderly. At the same time, he could not doubt that they were committing a great mistake. It was not by pomp and ceremonial that our Lord and the Apostles induced the people to bow down and confess the truth, but by the use of the simplest forms."

Neither so far as mere scenic effect is concerned,—and this seems to be the great argument at the present day,—is anything gained in the end, by such awful pageantry. Even the scenes of the Cross, as a mere pompous display to charm the senses, wear out at last, and lose their power. In Italy, even High Mass has become an old story. A writer in the (London) *Guardian*, (Oct. 18, 1865,) says:—

"At the Cathedral of Florence, High Mass now often goes on at the grand altar in presence only of a few curious strangers or lookers-on. The officiating priests themselves seem to be quite conscious that they have lost their audience on such occasions, and to feel as though they were going through a form that had become well-nigh obsolete. Nothing can exceed the rapidity with which the Office is conducted. The vast band of performers wheel about with the celerity of a *corps de ballet*; and the business is got through and the long procession files off into the sacristy and disappears, in a way not at all usual with Roman Catholic ceremonies which are in vogue. The impression conveyed is, that this most solemn celebration of divine worship and chief observance of the Sunday, is fallen in popular estimation, and that the officiators are aware of it, and get through the prescribed ritual, as far as possible, as through a worn-out piece. Meanwhile, however, at precisely the same hour and on the same day, the chapel of the Virgin, which stands immediately behind the neglected chief altar, is blazing with lights and thronged with devotees of all classes and sexes, though chiefly females; and if you take your stand for a time by the marble screen which encircles the high altar, you will see that the entire tide of congregation, ladies of the highest fashion as well as the humblest *contadina*, including such men as enter the Church—all, almost without exception, pass by the principal service, even as it is going on, and join the more popular assemblage on the other side."

Before leaving this whole subject, there is another aspect of it, on which a few considerations may be offered, as a fitting conclusion. The conception of Priest, Altar, and Sacrifice, does not comprise all the functions of the Christian Ministry. The Christian Dispensation, as such, differs from the Jewish Dispensation, which it followed and supplemented. How it differs, what the distinguishing features of these two great Sys-

tems are, is not a matter of human speculation. He Who "taketh away the first that He may establish the second," has framed His Church and ordained its functions, as it pleaseth Him. That He appointed the Sacrament of His Supper, and that that Sacrament has all the essential features of a Christian Sacrifice, we have aimed to show. Yet no one can examine the language of His last Commission to His Apostles, no one can read the inspired record of the labors of those men, clothed with the special Gifts of the Holy Ghost, without feeling that the Offering of Sacrifice was not the only vocation to which these men were set apart; as it had been the special duty and service of the Jewish Priesthood. They were, as their very name implies, emphatically the "Sent."

"All power is given unto Me, in Heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you, always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. xxviii. 18-20.

"And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." John xx. 22, 23.

Here is their Commission, the letter of their instructions. They followed those instructions. They went forth to spread the blessings of a "finished" work,—the work "finished," completed on the Cross. Judaism, as its special mission, foreshadowed the Sacrifice of the Cross. Christianity proclaims and dispenses to all the nations the Gospel purchased by Christ's Blood. Study the history of those inspired men, read the life of St. Paul, catch, in all his Epistles, the spirit, intent, object, which filled and fired his heart, and see what he conceived to be his great work. With more than four-fifths of the twelve hundred millions of our race, still, in this nineteenth century, in the very depths of heathenish darkness, with such multitudes at our doors, and all around us, educated and uneducated, rich and poor, to whom the preaching of Christ and Him Crucified is as intense foolishness, as it was to the Greeks in the days of St. Paul; with the frightful



spread of Heresy and Schism, on our right hand and on our left ;—look upon all this, and then say, whether a Eucharistic Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving, measures all the Church's duty. Say, if a most fitting Sacrifice for Churchmen to render, at the present day, is not the Sacrifice of themselves, their souls and bodies,—of all that they have and are, on the Altar of obedience to the last command of our ascended LORD and GOD, JESUS CHRIST ? Will He accept any other Sacrifice, or look upon it as other than a solemn mockery, a hypocritical and vain show, so long as this is withheld ?

## ART. II.—WHO WERE THE EARLY SETTLERS OF MARYLAND?

IF this question be answered in reference to individuals, we are shown that Kent Island, in the Chesapeake Bay, the first settlement in what is now the State of Maryland, was settled under the proprietorship of William Claiborne, a member of the Council and Secretary of State, of the Virginia Colony. But the names of the individual settlers under him during the first five years, have not come down to us.

The next settlement, four or five years later, was under the proprietorship of Cecelius Calvert, Baron of Baltimore. In his third "relation of Maryland," that of A. D., 1635, he has given us the names of his first Colonists, styled gentlemen, and the number of their servants. The gentlemen adventurers that embarked, were seventeen, namely: two of his Lordship's brothers; two Commissioners; a son of Sir Thomas Gerard; two sons of Lady Anne Wintour; a son of Sir Thomas Wiseman, and nine others, whose names, simply, are mentioned. These, with their servants, numbered about two hundred. Of these, George, one of the sons of lord Baltimore, remained in Virginia, and never came to Maryland; and two died on their passage, leaving only fourteen to have settled here. Of this fourteen, at the end of four years, nine had died, or moved. In a few years, four of these five died, and the last one returned to England. No one of all these left any descendants in the Province. The names of the servants, for the most part, are still found on the land records,—as are those of the subsequent emigrants,—and at the end of four years, some of these had become land-holders, and have the titles of "freemen" and "gentlemen," affixed to their names. Of this class, some of their descendants are among the most prominent families in the State.

In the further answer to our question, we may look at it in two aspects. First, what was their Nationality, and secondly, what was their Religion.

In reference to the first, it is generally stated in our newspapers, and in our school books, that it was settled by the Irish. This is a palpable error, and truth requires its correction. In this paper, it is not designed to go at large into an examination of this point. But it may be stated, in passing, that the larger number, for thirty years, were from the Province of Virginia; so that it was early said, and frequently said by those of that Province, that one half of it was depopulated to settle Maryland. It is not indeed probable, that all of these settlers were natives of that Province; but from what foreign country those who were not, came, cannot here be shown, save generally, that they were of English birth.

The next larger number were natives of England, including Wales. Then came, in no inconsiderable numbers, natives of Scotland. Then, those of France, who were Huguenots. Then, from Germany, Holland, Bohemia, Spain, Italy, and last, if not least of all, from Ireland,—saving Irish servants. It was a mingled mass of Celtic, Gothic, Slavonic and even Hamitic origin. To examine this point at large, and in detail, however, is not our present purpose. Though interesting, in many points of view to do so, we have neither time nor space. It is a subject sufficient for a paper by itself. What has been stated, is enough to show the untruth to which we have referred, and should lead to the correction, at least of the school books of our country. They have too long already taught positive error on this point.

In reference to the second aspect mentioned,—it is generally, nay, almost universally held, that Maryland was settled, in early times, by and with Roman Catholics; using the name in its popular acceptation. In answer to this, the following statements will tell their own story, and that faithfully and truly. We will look, first, at the early settlements of each of the ten Counties established under Lord Baltimore's administration of the Government, previous to 1688,—when, as a Romanist, his government ceased.

(1st.) The first, in chronological order of settlement, was *Kent County*, embracing, at its beginning, Kent Island only. This was in 1628 or 9. It is the Island, as so well known, in

the Chesapeake Bay, opposite to the City of Annapolis. The settlers here were then a part of the Virginia Colony, and all of them were Church of England men,—as were all in that Colony,—no others being then allowed to reside there, by the regulations of the English Government. The Rev. Richard James, and other Church of England Ministers from Jamestown, ministered in this settlement; all this we are shown from Virginia records and English documents. This settlement was a Protestant settlement.

(2d.) The next, in order of time, was *St. Mary's County*, under Lord Baltimore, who, by the way, as so well known, was an Englishman, as his long line of ancestry also had been. His title, indeed, was that of an Irish Baron, though he himself never resided in Ireland. In 1634, he sent over his first Colonists, all Englishmen; consisting, as before mentioned, of seventeen gentlemen and their servants, who seated themselves *St. George's* on the River emptying into the Potomac, and not very distant therefrom, in a town which they named *St. Mary's*.

Who this Colony was made up of, may be seen from the letters of Father White, who came over with the first emigrants. His statement is this; "if you except sea-sickness, no one [on board the vessels coming over] was attacked with any disease, till the Festival of the Nativity of our Lord [Christmas]. That the day might be more joyfully celebrated, the wine flowed freely, and some who drank immoderately, about thirty in number, were seized the next day with the fever, and twelve of them not long after died, and among them, two Catholics, Nicholas Fairfax and James Barefoot, which caused great regret with us all." These were two of the seventeen gentlemen before mentioned. This may show us, that a very large proportion of the Colonists certainly were not Romanists. Among them, however, were two Jesuit Priests, who at once secured a chapel for their services in *St. Mary's Town*.

How soon the Protestants had a Church, is not stated. But in our very earliest documents, we find mention of Trinity Church, on Trinity Creek, six miles south of *St. Mary's*. Soon after, we have mention of *St. George's Church*, four or five miles West of *St. Mary's*; and in 1642, we have an account

of a Protestant Church in St. Clement's hundred, on St. Paul's Creek, some twenty or thirty miles up the Potomac. There were now, thus, three Protestant Churches, but no second Romanist Chapel had been yet established; and Protestant Churches still stand on, or near the ground, where these three were.

Three years after this, that is, in 1645, occurred here what is known as Ingle's Rebellion, (not Claiborn's, as it is so often called,) he acting, as it is stated, under the authority of Parliament, which was then in the ascendant in England. In a letter written by the Maryland Assembly to Lord Baltimore, touching the matter, they state that *almost all the Romanists were driven out of St. Mary's at that time*. The government, consequently, fell into the hands of the Protestants, and St. Mary's itself was then Protestant. But in about two years, Governor Calvert, by the aid of Virginia soldiers, recovered his government. What portion of the banished Romanists returned, has not been ascertained.

(3d.) In 1648, Lord Baltimore appointed Colonel William Stone, of Virginia, a Protestant, his Lieut. Governor in Maryland, on condition of his bringing into the Province five hundred Colonists; and with this condition it was accepted. Now then we have a third settlement, known as *Ann Arundel* County. It was on the Western shore of the Chesapeake Bay, North of St. Mary's, and opposite to Kent Island. It included all the territory on the Bay, North of the Patuxent River. In the next year, 1649, and soon after, the five hundred Colonists engaged to be brought in by Col. Stone, arrived. Some were from England, but the rest came in from Virginia, and settled on the Bay Shore, and its tributaries, from the Patuxent to the North of the Severn River. These were all Protestants, for, as we have seen, no others had been permitted to reside in Virginia. Of this number, about one hundred were of the Puritan stamp, and settled immediately on the Severn. The rest were adherents of the Church of England.

In 1650, there arrived from England another small Colony. This was under the command of Robert Brooke, Esq. For this Colony, Lord Baltimore created a County on the South

and South West side of the Patuxent, reaching from the Chesapeake Bay upwards, along its borders some fifty miles or more, which he named Charles. This County lay between St. Mary's on the South and Ann Arundel on the North. To Mr. Brooke, Lord Baltimore, as the document has it, gave the license and advowson of all the Churches in his County, which might be built. With him, came in the Rev. William Wilkinson, a Church of England Minister. This, too, was a Protestant Colony,—Mr. Bozman thinks it was Puritan; but it was of the "High Church" stamp. In one of the hundreds which this County included, there had been previously settled a few Romanist families.

In 1654 there occurred, near where Annapolis now stands, the celebrated battle, between the St. Mary's County men, under Gov. Stone, and the Providence men, as the residents of Ann Arundel County were then called. Of this battle, Capt. Heamans published a statement. In the year following, Mr. John Hammond, a friend of Lord Baltimore, published an answer, now before us. In that answer, we have these words,—“but those *few* papists that were in Maryland,—for indeed they were but few.” Mr. Hammond had resided in Maryland, and spoke of what he knew. Nor was he at all partial to the men of Ann Arundel. This was only twenty years after the landing at St. Mary's.

(4th.) After this battle, and during the year 1654, the lower part of Ann Arundel, and Mr. Brooke's Charles County, were combined into one County, which was called *Calvert*. This constituted the fourth County. This arrangement, however, did not change the character of the population embraced in it; it was well nigh all Protestant.

(5th.) The fifth County established, was *Charles County*, now so known. This was in 1658. It is on the Potomac River, and North West of St. Mary's, from which it is separated by the Wicomico River. It was created thus, out of the north western part of St. Mary's County, and its population, consequently, was a mingled one of Roman Catholics and Protestants, just as it was before being made a separate County.

(6th.) The sixth County was created in 1659. This was named *Baltimore*, and embraced the northern part of Ann Arundel County, extending from *below* the Patapsco River, to the northern limits of the province. What part of this County had been settled, was, as was all Arundel, Protestant. The additions to its population were from England, and of the Church of England.

Thus much for the five Counties on the Western shore of the Bay, to 1659, and no new one was added, for near forty years. Three were entirely Protestant, and the other two, only in part Roman Catholic.

About this time, there came in some Quaker preachers from England, and numbers of the Puritan part of the settlers in Ann Arundel, and in Calvert, East of the Patuxent, went over to that denomination.

Turning now again to the Eastern shore of the Chesapeake, we have already seen that the first settlement on Maryland territory, was made on that shore, and became Kent County, and that it was Protestant.

(7th.) In 1660, or in 1661, a new County was constituted, out of the southern part of Kent County, extending South to the Choptank River. And, as was the population of Kent, so consequently was this, Protestant. Its early population had been much added to by emigrants from Ann Arundel County, and also from England, who likewise were either Puritans or Church of England men,—Protestants of course.

(8th.) Five years after this, in 1666, a third County was created, and named *Somerset*, extending from Accomac County in Virginia, northward, and from the Atlantic shore on the East, to the Chesapeake Bay and Nanticoke River on the West. The early settlers of this County were all from Accomac County, and, as the Virginians were, excepting three or four Quakers, were of the Church of England. We have a full account of them from Virginia Records. Shortly after the County was constituted, it had a large accession of emigrants from Scotland. These were Presbyterians, who erected a number of their churches; and here, says Webster's History of Presbyterianism, was the first organized Presbytery, and



here was the cradle of that denomination in the United States. It was thus an entirely Protestant County.

(9th.) In 1669, *Dorchester County*, on the Bay, north west of Somerset, and South of Talbot, having Choptank River on the North, was created. The population, like that of Somerset, was Protestant. Some of it, indeed, was Puritan.

(10.) Five years after that, in 1664, *Cecil County* was created, it having before been the northern parts of Kent, and Ann Arundel Counties. It extended from Delaware, on the East, to the Bay and Susquehannah River on the West, and North to the limits of the Province. Above the Bohemia River, the population was Lutheran. Before the settlement at St. Mary's, the Swedes had made a settlement on the Delaware.<sup>2</sup> Soon after the Dutch came on, and in the progress of thirty years, the population had extended across to the Bay. Subsequently, there came in from New York, the Hermans, and settled a little below Bohemia River. They, too, were Lutherans. Cecil thus was a County of Protestants. Thus, on the Eastern shore of the Bay, every one of the five Counties were settled by Protestants, and no one, even in part, by the Romanists.

Such, in this aspect of the matter, were the early settlers of Maryland, during the first thirty years. In the ten Counties, five being on each side of the Bay, only two, St. Mary's and Charles, on the Potomac, had any Roman Catholic population, and these were only in part such. And yet it is claimed now, and said constantly, that Maryland was settled with Roman Catholics!!—betraying an ignorance utterly without excuse.

To the statements now made, taken from more than thirty documents, we will refer to subsequent documents on record, either sustaining them, or showing the permanent continuance of the truth, of what might justly be inferred from them.

And first, we have Lord Baltimore's own statement, made twelve years after the last date mentioned. In 1676, complaint was laid before the Privy council, by the Bishop of London, about the want of support given to the Church of England Ministers in Maryland. Its population was now stated at 20,000. Lord Baltimore's answer was very soon laid before

the Council, and is still in their archives. (2. Anderson's Colonial Church, 398.) In that answer he said, that Presbyterians, Independents and Quakers, constituted three-fourths of the population, that is, 15,000; and that the four Church of England Ministers, already in the Province, had a decent subsistence. Assuming the statement of the three-fourths to be correct, there was but 5,000 left of Church of England men and Romanists. If the Church of England Ministers, ministered to scattered congregations, of which there were many, counting in all eight hundred or a thousand to each Minister, we see at once how very few Roman Catholics there were then in the two counties in which they were found; and yet, such as we have seen, was Lord Baltimore's own statement. And we cannot deny that he was a competent witness.

Twelve years after this, that is, 1688, occurred in Maryland, what is known as the Protestant Revolution. At that time, the Roman Catholic Lord Baltimore's government ceased in the Province; and as Roman Catholic, ceased forever. For the *third time*, the government now fell into the hands of the Protestants, and so ever after continued. But though the government was thus wrested from Lord Baltimore, his chartered estate was continued to him.

In a letter of Mrs. Barbara Smith, who had resided in Maryland, dated Dec. 1689, just subsequent to the Revolution, touching Calvert County, she tells us, that, "the men of estate, or men of note, *were themselves, as were most of the County, Protestants;*" and that "the County of Ann Arundel, accounted the most populous and richest of the whole Province, *had but one Papist family;*" thus coinciding with what is stated of these Counties forty years before. They had not lost anything, during that period, of their early Protestant character.

In 1692, the Church of England became the established Church of Maryland, by the Act of its General Assembly. In this Assembly, the Roman Catholics were excluded, and the only other opponents to the Act, as we shall see proof of presently, were the Quakers. The population of the Province was now, 25,000. By the passage of this Act, we are shown that

the Church of England men were decidedly a majority over Lord Baltimore's Presbyterians, Independents and Quakers. Had it not been so, how could the Act possibly have been passed?

Within two years after the passage of this Act, the several County authorities, as was therein provided, divided their Counties into thirty Parishes. We will give a condensed statement here of the reports on record of these parishes, constituted by these authorities, as returned to the Governor and Council, adding, only in a few cases, some items from ancient parochial records, which we have examined.

St. Mary's County, according to the returns made, was divided into two parishes, which had the three Churches mentioned in 1642, but only one Einister.

Kent County was divided into two parishes, and had two Churches, but had no Minister.

Ann Arundel County was divided into four parishes, but had only two Churches, and one Minister.

Calvert County was divided into four parishes, and had three Churches, and two Ministers.

Charles County was divided into three parishes, having but two Churches and one Minister.

Baltimore County was divided into three parishes, but had only two Churches, and no Minister.

Talbot County was divided into three parishes, having four or more Churches, and two Ministers.

Somerset County was divided into four parishes, but had only one Church, and one Minister.

Dorchester was divided into two parishes, and had one Church, but no Minister.

Cecil County was divided into two parishes, and had two Churches, yet but one Minister.

There were thus, in these thirty parishes at this time, twenty-two Churches, and nine Church of England Ministers.

Two years after, three more Churches had been built, and nine Ministers had come in, making the whole number of Ministers in the parishes, eighteen, and the number of their places of worship, twenty-five.

At this date, 1696 or 7, we have the Report of the Governor of Maryland, from items furnished him, on his requisition, by the Sheriffs of the Counties, made to the Bishop of London. It is found in the archives of Maryland, and in those of that Bishop. From this Report, we have condensed the following statement, using, far as possible, its own words.

Kent County had no Popish Priest, lay brother, nor Romish place of worship, and but three Papists. There were twenty-four Quakers, who had one meeting-house.

In St. Mary's County, there were two Priests, one lay brother, and four Chapels. But there were no Quakers, or Dissenters.

In Ann Arundel County, there was neither Priest nor lay brother. But the Quakers had two meeting-houses, two meetings in private houses, and two preachers.

In Calvert County, there was neither Priest nor lay brother, nor any of their Churches, or Chapels. But the Quakers had one meeting-house, and one meeting at a private house.

Charles County had three Romish Priests, one lay brother, and four Chapels, but had no Quaker meeting-house, and only two Quakers.

Baltimore County had neither teacher, nor place of worship, either of Roman Catholics or Quakers.

Talbot County had no Romish Priest, or lay brother, and but one Romish Chapel. It had, however, four Quaker meeting-houses. The number of preachers is not given, if there were any, at this time.

Somerset County had no Popish Priest, lay brothers, or any of their Chapels, and no Quakers. But it had three Dissenting [Presbyterian] places of worship.

Dorchester County had no Romish Priest, or dissenting Minister.

Cecil County made no returns. There was indeed none to make.

Prince George County, which had been constituted the previous year, made of the northern parts of Calvert and Charles Counties, lying between the Potomac and Patuxent Rivers, reported that there was in it, neither Papist, Priest, nor lay brother, nor Chapel, nor Quaker meeting house.

Thus we have, in the two Counties where they were found, in their beginning, five Romish Priests, two lay brothers, and eight Churches and Chapels, and none in any other County, except a Chapel in Talbot.

In four Counties, the Quakers had eight meeting-houses, and three meetings in private houses, and none in the other Counties. Only two preachers are returned by the Sheriffs.

In one County, the Presbyterians had three houses of worship, and we may add, from other documents, two Ministers. Two others, one in Talbot and one in Ann Arundel, were there in 1694, but, as it appears, they were now gone.

Thus we have, *in all*, Roman Catholic, Quakers, and Presbyterians, according to the returns made, nine religious teachers and ministers, and twenty places of worship, not of the Church of England; while that Church had eighteen Ministers, and twenty-five places of worship,—thus outnumbering all the other denominations.

And now we will quote from a document which carries us back to the beginning again. In July, 1700, a Committee of his majesty's Council to the Governor, was appointed to address the Privy Council in England, vindicating the Governor and Council from some aspersions cast upon the Government of Maryland, by some persons calling themselves *ancient planters*, in connection with the Act establishing the Church. And they say :—

“ We humbly assure your Lordships, that whatever titles persons may give themselves, of dissenting Protestants, there has *no sect of Religion* here, opposed the law, but the Papists and Quakers, and, as for their [the Papists] being ancient settlers, we acknowledge that *some*, though but *few* Papists, were at the *first* seating. But, so far were the Quakers from being the most ancient seaters, that when they first came in, [in 1659,] they were ordered to be whipped out, for disturbing the government, and they are now, so far from being any considerable part, that we are confident they will not make the twentieth part of the province.”

It is but fair, however, to state, that it is said the Quakers disowned these disturbers of the Government.

This is signed by John Addison, Thomas Brooke, Thomas Tasker, and John Hammond,—names well known in their

descendants, and who came into the province before thirty years after the first landing at St. Mary's. They knew whereof they affirmed.

Of the same date, 1700, we have a statement from the Rev. Dr. Bray, touching the then present state of things. He was the Bishop of London's Commissary in Maryland, and a man of high character. In a Memorial addressed to the House of Bishops in England, this year, after having been in Maryland, he writes thus:—"The Papists in this province appear to me to be not above a twelfth part of the inhabitants, but their Priests are very numerous, whereof more have been sent in this last year, than was ever known. And though the Quakers brag so much of their numbers and riches, yet they are not above a tenth part [of the population] in number." This was not indeed guess work; it was shown by the return of the County Sheriffs.

These testimonies, we doubt not, will be sufficient to show who, in respect to their Religion, were the early settlers in Maryland. They would be held so in any Court of Law, and more especially so, where, as in this case, there is no counter testimony.

But it may not be without interest to give some later testimony, to show how this matter continued, subsequent to 1700.

In 1715, The Lords Baltimore, having become Protestant, the Government of Maryland was restored to them by King George I., and continued to be Protestant, just as it had been since 1688. Henceforward, the Governors of the Province were appointed by them, just as they had been by the King, for the last twenty-five years.

During the administration of one of the Governors, that of Gov. Sharpe, there was quite a panic in the Province, in which the Roman Catholics were implicated. It was spread abroad that a general massacre of the Protestants had been plotted. To counteract this, the Governor ordered the County Sheriffs, in 1758, to make returns to him of all the Roman Catholics in their respective Counties, and these returns are on record still, in the archives at Annapolis. And we have the summing up of them, in a letter from Gov. Sharpe to Lord

Baltimore, of Dec. 19, 1758, in these words:—"The people of that Religion, [the Roman Catholic,] do not, at present, make a thirteenth part of the inhabitants, [the population now was upwards of 200,000,] as I find by the returns of the Sheriffs and Constables, who have, in obedience to my order, made the most strict inquiry in their respective districts. And the rolls returned by the collectors of the land tax, show that they are not possessed of a twelfth part of the land, which is held under your Lordship, as proprietor of Maryland." We are shown, thus, that during the one hundred and twenty-four years of the existence of the Province, there had been no increase of the proportion of Roman Catholics to the Protestants in Maryland. It was still Protestant, *not* Roman Catholic Maryland.

We have yet another series of papers in the Maryland archives, of no little interest, not as showing so much the comparative numbers of the Established Church with the other Denominations, which it nevertheless does to some extent show, but its comparative ability and liberality. Since 1695, three new Counties had been added to the eleven then mentioned; namely, Frederick, on the Western, and Queen Anne and Worcester Counties, on the Eastern shore.

In 1760, there was a great fire in Boston, Mass., which destroyed one hundred and seventy-four dwelling houses, and as many warehouses and shops and other buildings, which, with the furniture and goods burnt, made the estimated loss to be £100,000 sterling; \$433,000. The Governor of Massachusetts applied to the Governor of Maryland for aid, and Governor Sharpe issued his brief, now before us, to *every worshipping congregation* in the Province, with directions, that collections be taken up, and the amounts severally remitted to him. This was done, and the returns made give us the following facts:—

St. Mary's County, from its 4 parishes, with 4 Clergy-	£	s.	d.
men, sent - ( <i>sterling</i> ,)	146	13	0
" " " 4 Romanist Clergymen, sent	31	13	0
Charles County, from its 4 parishes, having 4 Clergy-			
men, sent, - -	128	05	11



40 *Who were the Early Settlers of Maryland?* [April,

	£	s.	d.
Charles County, from its 2 Romanist Clergymen,	45	19	3
Prince George Co., from its 3 parishes, having 3 Clergymen, sent - - -	196	16	9
Frederick Co., from its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent - - -	56	1	6
“ “ the Presbyterians, sent - - -	9	3	7
“ “ the Dunkers, - - -	6	0	0
“ “ the Lutherans, - - -	4	16	0
Calvert Co., “ its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent - - -	54	3	5
Ann Arundel Co., from its 5 parishes, having 4 Clergymen, sent - - -	127	9	5
“ “ “ the Quakers, sent - - -	92	5	0
Baltimore Co., from its 4 parishes, having 4 Clergymen, sent - - -	142	14	9
“ “ the Quakers “ - - -	23	19	0
“ “ the Baptists “ - - -	7	0	0
“ “ the Romanists “ - - -	2	17	6
Cecil Co., from its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent - - -	53	9	4
“ “ the Presbyterians sent - - -	25	11	0
Kent Co., “ its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent - - -	72	18	1
“ “ 3 Quaker meetings, sent - - -	18	0	0
“ “ the Presbyterians, “ - - -	2	2	6
Queen Anne Co., from its 4 parishes, having 4 Clergymen, sent - - -	120	18	8
“ “ “ the Presbyterians, sent - - -	10	2	6
Talbot Co., from its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent - - -	232	19	7
Dorchester Co., from its 3 parishes, having 3 Clergymen, sent - - -	123	16	2
Somerset Co., from its 3 parishes, having 3 Clergymen, sent - - -	109	0	6
“ “ the Presbyterians, sent - - -	43	3	1
Worcester Co., “ its 2 parishes, having 2 Clergymen, sent - - -	61	17	0
“ “ the Presbyterians, sent - - -	19	12	0

Thus from the 14 Counties,

The Church, from its 42 parishes, having 41 Ministers, sent - - -	1,503	7	11
The Quakers sent - - - - -	134	4	0
The Presbyterians, - - - - -	107	12	2
Six Romanist Priests—5 contributions, sent - - -	76	0	9
The Baptists sent - - - - -	7	0	0
The Dunkers sent - - - - -	6	0	0
The Lutherans sent - - - - -	4	16	0

Making nearly \$9,000 in all, or £1,839 0 10

The other denominations than the Church, sent £315 12 11 of this amount.

It will be seen that while, since 1700, the increase of Counties had been only three, that of the parishes had been twelve.

The next statement we give is from Mr. Eddis, dated April 2, 1772, then Surveyor of Customs, residing at Annapolis. Writing to a friend in England, he says, "their number [the Romanists] are at present very inconsiderable, and their influence of no weight in the concerns of the Province."

More testimony, indeed, might be presented, concurring with what has now been brought forward. But this is deemed sufficient to sustain the fact, that Maryland never was "Catholic Maryland," notwithstanding the slang of our School Histories, and speeches of politicians. We have here, all these documents, running through a period of one hundred and thirty-five years,—documents which have never been impeached, never contradicted, all telling the same story.

As a fitting *appendix* to the foregoing, we conclude this paper with the following extract from the speech of Governor Hart, to the General Assembly of Maryland, in 1720, copied from its proceedings.

"Gentlemen:—The pretence of the Romanists that Maryland was granted as an asylum to them, from the rigor of the penal laws in England, is a position of theirs which has long amused the world. It was an imposition. For they cannot have a better right, than what the Charter admits them to, and, in my opinion, there is so far from a provision made therein that the government should be in their hands, in any degree, that there is not an exception made for the exercise of their Religion. 'It hath been affirmed, that Cecelius, Lord Baltimore, published a declaration, inviting all persons that believed on the name of Jesus Christ, to settle and inhabit this Province, promising them equal privileges. Yet I presume it will be admitted, that noble Lord could not give greater powers than he had.'

"For, after all the privileges mentioned in the Charter, toward the conclusion, there is this provision made, namely:—"provided always, that no interpretation be admitted thereof, by which God's holy and truly Christian Religion, or the allegiance due unto us, our heirs and successors, may in any wise suffer any prejudice or diminution.' The Charter was granted by King Charles the First, who was a Protestant, and certainly could not intend the proviso for any other Religion, than that of which he was a zealous professor. But to make this the more evident, it is expressly stipulated in the body of the Charter, that all churches, chapels, and oratories, be dedicated and consecrated according to the Ecclesiastical law of the kingdom of England.

This so well explains itself, that it wants no comment. I am only surprised, from what latent cause the Papists derive any privileges here, beyond what the connivance of Government may indulge them in.

"In reply, the Lower House of Assembly said :—'We know of no legal right they [the Papists] have to any more than they enjoy,' " &c.

This, it may be remembered, was the publicly expressed and received view of those in the highest places of authority in Maryland, one hundred and twenty-five years ago.

## ART. III.—DR. BEARDSLEY'S HISTORY.

*The History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, from the settlement of the Colony to the death of Bishop Seabury.*

By E. EDWARDS BEARDSLEY, D.D., Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New Haven. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1865. pp. 470.

To write the history of a single Diocese is no easy task. The larger field of a National Church allows wider views, and sweeps away many matters of minute detail. The narrower limit of a single Parish requires detail, and excuses from more general statements. But the Diocese is the very point where the general and the minute—of very need—so meet and mingle, that their adjustment becomes a delicate, and, often, a perplexing task.

We mention it at the outset, as a prime excellence in Dr. Beardsley's admirable History, that he has succeeded in this point of capital difficulty. The life-giving detail always keeps the interest alive, while yet it never clogs the march and movement of the general view. In fact, the two work together; and whether the author gained this point spontaneously, or toiled for it with conscious labor, he *has* gained it, and, in so doing, achieved no mean success.

A second excellence of which we wish to speak before we proceed to other things, is found in the distribution of the subject matter, the divisions of the period treated of. Somebody once said, that he never sat down to read a History till he had looked over the table of contents, and saw how the author laid out his plans; deciding, by this, whether to read or to let alone. It was no unwise precaution. An intelligent division makes an intelligent history, and *vice versa*. In the one case you have an articulated body of facts, in the other a hap-hazard jumble. Dr. Beardsley's admirable division has much to do with the lucid clearness of his narration.

These greater excellencies include most minor ones. And so Connecticut and the Church at large have to thank our author for a work, so well done that it leaves nothing to be desired—except its continuance and completion.

The writer of the History of our Church in any part of New England, finds himself, of course, brought at once into contact with the Puritans, and is forthwith driven to the ungracious work of the iconoclast. It is impossible to tell the plain historic truth, without exposing the hollowness and shams of the image so long worshipped. It is difficult to make the exposure which truth demands, and yet do the justice which is equally required. It is easy to picture men as saints: it is easy to paint them as sinners. But to bring out the mixture of qualities, characteristics and motives, which, in nine cases out of ten, forms the task of the historian, is another, and a much more difficult thing. And the difficulty is greatly increased when, as in the present case, unreal claims dispose people to look with suspicion upon real ones. If the Puritans are likely, in these days, to be rated at a lower than their real worth, it is simply the result of the pertinacious claim which has been so long set up for them, of purposes which they never entertained, and principles from which they would have shrunk with horror.

One sentence, quoted by our author from Dr. Trumbull's History of Connecticut, brings out the unreal claim, the pressing of which has, as we have said, driven people to the other extreme. "The settlement of New England, *purely for the purposes of religion*, and the *propagation of CIVIL and RELIGIOUS LIBERTY*, is an event which has no parallel in the history of modern ages." Now that civil and religious liberty have come to be the possession of the dwellers in New England, is quite true. That the Puritans intended to make them their possession, that they knew, recognised or possessed the principles of either form of liberty, is utterly untrue. They claimed liberty for themselves, they never intended to give it to others. Nor can they be asserted to be its founders, by any other process than a free use of the fallacy *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*.

They brought with them to New England "the stock of

freedom." Was it their invention? It came to them in all its elements, and almost all its forms, from the old Saxon days. Nor was it a new thing when Alfred embodied its principles in his code, for even then, to use the words of Blackstone, "the customs and maxims so collected were of higher antiquity than memory or history can reach." And a marvellous vitality this stock possessed. In the mother country, it was overlaid, and often stifled, by feudal usages, royal prerogative, papal usurpations, and yet it lived and at last bore flower and fruitage. And so here, it came to the same results, not because, but in spite of the purposes and systems of the Puritans. Their ecclesiastical tyranny, not unlike in character to the papal, could no more kill it, than Warwick-like barons or Tudor and Stuart Kings. It lived in spite of all of them; but it owes none of them much thanks for its existence.

And as to religious liberty, why look—the story is an old one, but we cannot help it—at Anne Hutchinson, and Roger Williams, and the Quakers, and John Cotton's "Bloody tenent washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb," and Governor Dudley's Epitaph, written with his own hand, "I died no libertine," and a hundred other things that have been quoted and urged over and over again. The Puritans only knew the theory to detest and repudiate it. To claim them as its founders is just *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, again.

The truth is, civil and religious liberty, as we understand them, were known nowhere in those days. They were struggling into light. But they had not reached the light. And had the descendants and eulogizers of the Puritans modestly contented themselves with the simple truth, that they were as all others in these regards, they would have secured a much more general and much more ready acknowledgment of the many striking and noble qualities which, spite of all his faults, the Puritan really possessed. For, in this matter of persecution for conscience sake, we have all enough to be sorry for and ashamed of, as we look back on our respective histories. It is the unreal claim alone that blinds men to real ones. We feel bound, however, in all candor, to add, that we verily believe no people ever more readily mistook their wills for their consciences,

than the Puritans, and that "the little finger of Puritanism was thicker than the loins of Prelacy."

Dr. Beardsley strikes the balance well. He does not deny persecution in the Church of England. He quietly exhibits its severity in Puritan Connecticut. He can afford, while he sweeps away the shams with which school books and orations, and what goes under the name of history too, have enveloped the founders of New England, "to admire and honor none the less their zeal and bravery, their earnestness and energy, their faith and devotion." He writes moderately and calmly, like a man who has a reserved force at his command, and need not be over anxious to tell all he knows. And his words are, therefore, weighty. His condemnation tells, because it is accompanied with words of commendation, when commendation can honestly be given.

As we write, we cannot but remember, and remembering, we cannot but record the fact, that, at last, a descendant of the Puritans, and he not a Churchman, has, in a work published in Boston in the last year, fairly stated the simple truth. Says Mr. Parkman, in his most valuable "Pioneers of France in the New World ;" "At the outset, New England was unfaithful to the principles of her existence. *Seldom has religious tyranny assumed a form more oppressive than among the Puritan exiles.* New England Protestantism appealed to Liberty; then closed the door against her. On a stock of freedom, she grafted a scion of despotism; yet the vital juices of the root penetrated at last to the uttermost branches." At last the truth! "Church and State were not *united*, they were *identified*. A majority of the people, including men of wealth, ability, and character, were deprived of the rights of freemen, because they were not Church members. When some of them petitioned the General Court [in Massachusetts] for redress, they were imprisoned and heavily fined as guilty of sedition." Founders of civil freedom! "A New England Synod could not *coerce* an erring Church, it could only *advise* and *exhort*. This was clearly insufficient, and, accordingly, in cases of heresy and schism, the *civil power was invoked*. That is to say, the Churches, acting in their *ecclesiastical* capacity, consigned doc-



trinal offenders for punishment to the same Churches acting in a civil capacity.\* The Church of Rome called it "handing over to the secular arm," and in the naming lies the only difference, *quoad hoc*, between the two communions. Apostles of religious liberty!

We cannot follow Dr. Beardsley along the line of the persecutions endured by the early Churchmen of Connecticut. They are so inwoven into the narrative that they can hardly be separated from it. For the very full and clear statement of one matter, however, we are specially thankful; the history of the plots to prevent the introduction of the Episcopate into this country. Here it was that the jealousy of the Standing Order, and the culpable indifference of the Government at home, went hand in hand. Let Churchmen say what they would, assert what they would, the Puritan ministers would not believe that if Bishops came to America, they would come with any other character than that which they had in England, and be officers of State saddled on the country. Archbishop Secker might say in 1764, (only echoing what all the clergy who, on this side, urged an American Episcopate, had said), that the Bishops were to have no concern with any not of the Church of England, that they were to hold no courts, and try no causes, nor "to be vested with any authority now exercised, either by provincial Governors or subordinate magistrates;" and the sturdy Mayhew might be softened by it. But, though the statement was repeated and re-repeated from every quarter, Chauncey could insist, in 1767, that what was aimed at was nothing less than "complete Church Hierarchy, after the pattern of that at home, with

---

\* Parkman's *Pioneers*, &c., p. 396; text and notes. In an earlier portion of his work, he cites an Address presented to the King of Spain, by one Dr. Pedro de Santander, in 1557, in which occur these words,—“This [he is speaking specially of Florida] is the land of promise possessed by idolaters, the Amorite, Amalekite, Moabite, Canaanite. This is the land promised by the Eternal Father to the Faithful, since we are commanded by God, in the Holy Scriptures, to take it from them, being idolaters . . . and to put them all to the knife . . . save maidens and children.” Can the author have misquoted from Cotton Mather or some kindred spirit? Cotton Mather's explanation of the peopling of America by the Indians, was, “that the devil decoyed those miserable salvages hither, in hopes that the Gospel of Jesus Christ would never come here to destroy or disturb his absolute empire over them.”

like officers . . . with a large revenue for their grand support, and with the allowance of no other privilege to Dissenters but that of bare toleration;" and the General Association of Pastors of Connecticut could thank him for the slander.

After all, this opposition, not even in the form of that coalition which the unguarded publication of the Minutes of Convention revealed, is not the saddest page in this dreary part of our Church's colonial history. This might have been expected; this could be met. But what shall be said of the cruel apathy of the British Government? What of the deaf ear turned to those appeals which came borne on every western breeze? What of the fact that one-fifth of those who went on the weary journeys to England for ordination, never returned, but fell martyrs to their convictions of truth and duty? Here there can be no excuse. Here there can be only condemnation. And yet the very men whose plea was thus flung back in indifference and scorn, were the men who, a few years later on, held their oaths to that very Government too sacred to be violated, and suffered *for that from* which they had suffered so much and so long. An American Churchman forgets the trials placed on his Church by open enemies, when his blood boils—it is right sometimes for blood to boil—at this cruel neglect on the part of those to whom she had a right to look for help. But does the treatment differ greatly from the action of that Government in regard to the Canadian Church in our own time? Has it not always, and everywhere, sacrificed those whose allegiance it knew to be secure, that it might conciliate those on whose allegiance it could not count?

Let us turn to a brighter, better page; that on which is recorded the nursing care and noble beneficence of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. No Diocese owes more to it than the Diocese of Connecticut. For more than half a century it did there a work of fostering and cherishing, the fair fruits of which are seen, to-day, through all the Church's borders. The alms and charities of all those years, as well as the trials and sufferings, are laid up in the book of God's remembrance. We may forget them, we do forget them. But He does not. The soil of that old Diocese was wet with

the tears of men whose souls were wrung with bitter trials in their labors for the Faith and Church of Christ ; it was consecrated by the prayers of men who broke away from every earthly tie, because they loved Christ more, and who, in not few instances, "counted not their lives dear" to themselves, but laid them down for Him ; and alms were scattered over it, which, like the dew of heaven, were never seen, but in the issuings of bud and blossom, fruit and ingathered harvest. God be blessed for that noble Society, in remembering whose loving care, we forget the wicked apathy of civil rulers !

Dr. Beardsley shews, however, that in one respect the Society had less to do in Connecticut than in other places, namely, in finding missionaries. One is struck in reading the story, with the fact that almost all the missionaries of Connecticut were sons of the soil, men who—to use the words of Mr. Anderson—"not from a mere hereditary attachment to the Church of England, or indolent acquiescence in her teaching, but from a deep, abiding conviction," gave up more than we, in this day, are apt to think, for Christ and His Church.

It was, indeed, no light thing to do that which these men did. All influence, wealth, power, temporal advantage were in the hands of the "Standing Order." And on the other hand, the Churchmen were poor, despised, "a feeble folk," "everywhere spoken against." It is within the memory of living persons, that a young man was told in a village in Connecticut, that it seemed impossible he should be a Churchman, he was so evidently a person belonging to the better class in society. God chose then, no more than in Corinth, the "mighty and the noble." Their lack of this world's goods was long a reproach thrown by their Puritan neighbors on the Churchmen of Connecticut. And this lot of contempt and poverty was assumed by those "sons of the soil," whose convictions led them to the Church of England.

Nor was this all. There was that weary, dangerous voyage to England—a venture, be it observed, involving all the sea risks of the *Mayflower*, and how often repeated !—and there was beside a rupturing of family ties, that it is difficult for us to comprehend. When the venerable Mansfield set out on his

quest of Holy Orders, his own sister "prayed that he might be lost at sea!" Surely, if ever men, since the primitive age, left brethren, sisters, father, mother, houses, land, for Christ's sake, those men were the first missionaries of Connecticut. Well may we believe that the rest of the promise has been made good to them.

And yet they came, leaving all, they came, incurring all risks and hazards. A glance at the index, merely, of Dr. Beardsley's volume, shows the names of thirty-six natives of Connecticut, who, between 1722 and the war of the Revolution, sought Holy Orders in the Church of England. To such men ordination by a Bishop was a reality. While the very fact that they were born and bred on the soil, amid the scenes where, and with the people among whom, their labors were to be, explains the form of the growth of the Connecticut Church, and is one among many reasons why it has leavened as it has the body of the people.

Still—and we thank Dr. Beardsley for the admirable way in which he brings it out—it was no "one idea" process, that led these men to our Mother Church. The question of Orders, was, as in all such cases it must be, a present and a pressing one. It is interesting, in looking over some of the MSS. of Dr. Johnson\*—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—to see one containing reasons why he thinks he may rest in his congregational commission, and then, years later on, another, telling why he cannot; and one can see how hard the struggle was. Still this question, we say, was not all. It is well known that, apart from the question of the Episcopate, deep views of the Faith and the Christian life entered into his conversion. Scott's Christian Life was one of the books that had great weight with him; and he says, in a letter to President Clap† of Yale College, given in the Appendix to Dr. Beardsley's volume, "I would desire you to understand that my zeal

---

\* We can never forget the thrill with which we heard an aged Churchman say, that he just remembered seeing Dr. Johnson. It was almost like seeing the founder of the Church in Connecticut ourselves.

† President Clap thought Dr. Johnson had scruples about the Divinity of Christ. Very likely Dr. Clap did not quite understand Johnson's Nicene statements.

for that sacred *Depositum*, the CHRISTIAN FAITH, founded on those principles, a co-essential, co-eternal Trinity, and the divinity, incarnation, and satisfaction of Christ, is the very and sole reason of my zeal for the Church of England . . . as I have long been persuaded that she is, and will eventually be found, the only stable bulwark against all heresy and infidelity."

So it stood with Johnson, the founder of the Church in Connecticut. The Faith of the Catholic Creeds, as distinguished from the metaphysical systems of the New England Churches; the Christian Life of the Gospel-Law, without the conventionalities of Puritanism; these, besides the demands of what he held to be Apostolic Order, entered into his conversion. And what is true of him is true of others. It is a noble story. May the diocese, whose history it adorns, never forget it!

We have called attention to some of the salient points of Dr. Beardsley's History. A review of it we have not undertaken, for a review, in the proper sense of the word, can hardly be written. The book itself must be read. We are sure it will be. It should be found in the family of every Churchman in Connecticut, nay, we think, throughout the Church. But we speak especially of the former, because for them especially it was designed. To them it must have an interest which it cannot have elsewhere. We trust it will brighten, for them, the links in the chain of historic connection, carry them back into a more living sympathy with those who went before them, and help to settle them in those hereditary principles which have done so much, and done it so well, for Christ's Church within their borders. We know the author asks no better result of his labors than this will be.

A single word—and that we are sure a very satisfactory one to our readers—in closing. We are confident in the hope that the present instalment will not be all its author will give us of the History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut. We can afford to wait patiently for another volume, resting on the excellent promise of the first.

ART. IV.—THE STATE OF OUR RUBRICS, AS BEARING  
UPON NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN RITUALISM.

It is to be remembered, that our body of Rubrics is small and insufficient ; too small, indeed, for the requirements of the Service. For example, there is no rubrical direction for the conclusion of the Service on Sunday Morning, after the Sermon, when the Holy Communion is not to be celebrated. The same is true of all that follows Evening Prayer, on Sunday, including the Sermon. Some of our special Services, as that of Baptism, and that of Confirmation, are wanting in directions, as to the posture of the congregation, and on other points. And many other such deficiencies may be noted in the Prayer Book. Hence arises a variety of usage which cannot be controlled. In the Primitive Church, the voice of the Bishop determined these points. With us, it is quite as likely to create rebellion. There have been instances among us, of Episcopal recommendations, intended to produce uniformity of worship ; but we have never heard of one that was successful. The Minister may, if he will, submit a doubtful point of order to his Diocesan. Otherwise, he must, in such cases, be guided by the best authorities accessible to him. But this refers only to points where the Rubric is incomplete ; and does not sanction the addition of Forms beyond the need of the Service.

It may be said, that, where there is no Rubric, there is commonly a *general usage* ; and this may be supposed to have the binding effect of law. Not necessarily ; for a general usage may be a very vicious usage, which has arisen in a low state of the Church's life. With us, there are general usages which are worse than this ; which are in violation of *written law*. How few observe the rule with regard to the time of Baptism of young children. The Rubric at the end of the Communion Office implies, that the Communicants shall remain after the Blessing, to assist the Minister in eating and drinking the consecrated Bread and Wine ; but it is next to never done. Who ever sees water poured into the Font, as the

first act in the Service of Baptism ; though the Rubric requires it ? And so of the time of placing the Bread and Wine upon the Holy Table : compliance with the Rubric is increasing ; but general usage still violates it. And so of many other points, which we need not stay to notice. We lately heard a Minister spoken violently against, because he "*humbly* presented and placed" the Alms upon the Altar ; though the Rubric told him to do so.

There can be no question, that, when general usage violates the written law, the Minister has the right to abide by the latter ; and he ought to be allowed to return to it without censure. It is necessary, indeed, to do so, if the Prayer Book is to be the rule of practice. There may be, also, general usages which are no violations of law, but which have grown up in lax times, and which, on sound principles, deserve only reprobation. It were dangerous to say, that whatever has become common is, therefore, obligatory. The irreverent or slovenly practice of a few may grow, in time, to be the habit of the many. General usage, therefore, ought not to be beyond the reach of individual judgment.\* We cannot but think, that a Minister has a right to attack and, if he can, abolish, at least for his own congregation, settled practices which violate the Apostolic precept of "decency and order." The tendency of the age, and of most of our American notions, is to irreverence in sacred things ; and, therefore, of the two evils, excess and deficiency in reverential forms, it is more excusable for a Clergyman to incline to the former, than to the latter. Indeed, this is the strongest argument which we have heard, in favor of new developments of Ritualism. They may be needed, to bring the general practice of Church people up to the standard of the Prayer Book. This does not justify them in principle ; but, it may make one regard them with more patience, and with more hope of good results. By so much as one falls below the Prayer Book, the other exceeds : and hence there is

---

\* We need not look many years back to remember a strong and wide-spread prejudice against *chanting* the Psalter. It exists still, in many minds. And yet, *reading* the Psalter is, unquestionably, a degenerate use ; and the prejudice is the mere creation of long-continued habit.



a counterpoise. What is not fit for nutriment, may be good for medicine. But we need not all run into extremes. There is the middle way of the Church; and that is the line of duty.

Even when the general usage is not, in itself, reprehensible, it may be set aside by any Minister, or congregation, for what shall appear to them sufficient reason. The use of the metrical Psalms and Hymns, for example, is almost universal among us; but there is no obligation of law to use them in those parts of the Service where they are now used, or even to employ them at all. They are "allowed," not required, "to be sung in all Congregations of the Church." A Minister may discontinue the use of them, without censure, other than for the possible inexpediency of the act. And so of the mode of terminating the Service, Morning and Evening. There is a general custom, though by no means a uniform one,—some congregations concluding with a Collect and the Blessing, after Sermon in the Morning, others, with the Offertory and Prayer for the Church Militant, followed by the Blessing. There is, also, some variety of conclusion, in the afternoon. And each congregation, or its Minister, is legally at liberty to introduce still another method.

But the most difficult question arises with regard to the addition of entirely new Forms, or ceremonies. It is curious to see how they grow. Once, preaching in the black gown was almost universal among us. Now, preaching in the surplice, on Communion Sundays, is, we believe, the prevailing practice; and it is common on all occasions. Formerly, bowing in the Creed was far less general than now; and many Churches have, without offence, restored the ancient practice, required by Canon in the Church of England, of bowing at *every* mention of the Name of Jesus. One cannot but have noticed the increase, of late years, of the custom of Ministers and Choirs turning to the East, in saying the Creed, and in singing the *Gloria*. It is already established in good repute; and is likely to become a common practice.

Where are to be the metes and bounds of these additions? Sometimes, they are merely new ways of doing old things; as

in the change of direction in singing the *Gloria*. The Prayer Book prescribes nothing upon the subject ; and, custom aside, each way is as lawful as the other. It may be said, that no change should be made from established method, unless it be to return to a former usage which is more correct : but this leaves the door open to boundless innovations, depending only upon the private judgment of the innovator. The truth is, that we need, for our Clergy, a full *Directorium*, established by authority of General Convention : and, until we have it, unauthorized changes and additions are likely to go on, and increase among us. If a congregation sustains its Minister in making them, what is to hinder him ? And yet, in this way, great evils may be introduced, practices inconsistent with the spirit of our Reformed Church. Surplices for Choristers have become respectable ; and they have, in their favor, an argument from the English use. But we lately heard of an instance in which one of our congregations sent to a Roman Catholic Church, to get the pattern of the vestments of its altar-boys, by which to cut the new garments of its own juvenile Choristers.\*

The matter cannot be left to the discretion of Bishops,—each settling the details of liturgical usages in his own Diocese, after the primitive method,—without introducing discordant uses in the various Dioceses. We know of a Bishop who has recommended the universal use of the Surplice, in preaching, in his Diocese. We know of other Bishops who prefer the gown. One Bishop has advised the saying of a Collect and the Lord's Prayer, in the Pulpit, before Sermon, as is common in England. Not a Clergyman in his Diocese followed the advice ; and, probably, there is not another Bishop who would give the same advice. One has recommended bowing in the Creed. No Church in his Diocese changed its practice for his recommendation ; and other Bishops, who do not themselves bow in the Creed, would not recommend the act. If Bishops are to have the final control in the matter, each in his own

---

\* A few congregations, perhaps only two or three, bow at the words, " was made man," in the Creed. We may be mistaken, but we can remember no other authority for this than the Roman practice.

Diocese, the authority must be given to them by Canon. Their present right to dictate is not acknowledged, or submitted to. If authority is given by Canon, we must expect conflicting issues. One Bishop will have the Altar against the Chancel wall ; another will have it in the middle of the Sacramentum. One will insist on its being a table on legs ; another will prefer the Altar shape. Practical directions will be guided by Episcopal views of Theology ; and a Clergyman will require a special apprenticeship in each Diocese, before he is competent to officiate according to its "use." This would occasion little inconvenience, if our Dioceses were no more closely associated than those of the Primitive Church. But, under our confederate Constitution, the clashings of different customs would breed the most disreputable family quarrels. If our present system of association is to remain, nothing will serve but a *Directorium*, established by General Convention, or, more properly, by the House of Bishops, at the request of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

What, then, is to be done ? Have we no law to restrict innovation ? A congregation formed of homogeneous elements, and having a Rector of like mind with itself, introduces, let us say, vestments for its Choristers, like those of the Roman Acolytes ; adds to the Surplice of its Clergy, the Chasuble, and perhaps the Cope ; replaces the black with colored Stoles ; puts its Deacon's Scarf on one shoulder ; and, in its worship, places upon its Altar lighted candles, during the celebration of the Eucharist ; has the sign of the Cross made in the Invocation, and in blessing the people ; sings an Introit, perhaps in Latin, while Choristers and Clergy enter the Chancel, and does other such like things, sufficient to make its Worship quite unlike what is commonly seen in our Churches, while it strictly observes every Rubric in the Prayer Book ;—is there any existing law which can hinder, or arrest, the change ? We know of none. There is the common judgment of Church people. But, the congregation is independent. Its own members like the new use. The Bishop may condemn it. But he has no authority to abolish it. There is no legal power to prevent it as we now stand. It is easy to see the difference, and the line

of distinction between such a Worship and the sedate, reverent and orderly celebration of the Church's Services, according to the model presented in the Prayer Book, where nothing is added to the written use, unless it may be in some act of Service for the performance of which, as to its method, no rule is given; and then the method adopted is consonant with the general spirit of our Rubrics, or is determined by the best usage known in our own Communion.

To prevent this overstretch of Ritualism, the Church's law, as held and observed among us, provides no resource. Such a congregation may be ostracised. Other Church people may refuse to attend its Worship. Other Clergy may withhold countenance and aid from its Rector. We know not but that the Convention of the Diocese might exclude it from representation. But that would not banish it from the Communion of the Church; and, the Bishop could not, legally, withdraw his pastoral supervision, or refuse his official functions. We see not how its Rector could be impeached, as he will have violated no law. He does, we have supposed, all that the Church prescribes. He has exceeded common usage; but, the exact limit beyond which legalized use passes into transgression, has not been fixed. There are great varieties of practice in the Worship of different congregations, all allowed; and, there is no legal definition of the bounds of such allowance; and no man can be condemned without law. The arbitrary opinion of a Court would carry with it no lawful authority. The case is beyond judicature, in the present state of the Church's legislation. One may say, the Bishop's "Godly admonition" ought to avail. But the consequences of his position no one will accept. If it should avail here, it should avail in all matters of Rites and Ceremonies, the mode of conducting Services, arranging Chancels, &c. But who will acknowledge such arbitrary rule, under which may be exercised the tyranny of a partizan and the bitter prejudices of an extremist. The great body of Church people would deny the right of such unlimited dictation. It cannot be enforced, as no law sustains it.

There is no question, that greater attention is now given to the æsthetics of Religion, than has ever before appeared since

the Reformation. It runs parallel with the spirit of the times. Love of show, delight in the beautiful, fondness for whatever gratifies the senses, have grown among us as a people, until some of their manifestations have become both vicious in taste and extravagant in degree. It is the natural outgrowth of our advance as a nation, in wealth, and luxury, and effeminate living. In Religion, it is not confined to any party in the Church, nor to any denomination of Christians. It is seen in increasing taste for higher styles of Music, in more elaborate decorations of the Sanctuary, and in greater fondness for artistic effects, even in Worship. Take the use of *flowers*. Ten years ago, a Bishop refused to visit a Church for Confirmation, unless the Rector would promise not to use them for decoration, on occasion of Festivals. Now, their use for such purposes is well-nigh universal; and no one thinks of objecting to it. There may not be much of Religious feeling, or much sense of symbolism, in most persons, when they see them, even at Easter; but, they are a pretty thing, and the people like it. Their use is unauthorized by any rule; but, so are the evergreens at Christmas. Once established in custom, they have the same authority with the verdant dress of the Nativity; and they are more significant emblems of the Resurrection, than spruce and pine, laurel and holly, of the Birth. Their gradual introduction is an instance in point to show how easily, at this day, we advance in æsthetical developments. Even the Sects have caught the spirit of the thing; and, naturally; for, it grows out of the general taste of the people. Witness the gorgeous use of flowers, by all classes, at Burials. We know of a Presbyterian Society that spent \$500 for its floral decorations, last Easter; and, a Congregational Society, which had, at that time, a large and costly Cross, of the rarest flowers, standing upon its Communion Table. And, as for Music, our *Te Deum*, our *Gloria Patri*, our *Gloria in Excelsis*, and some of our Canticles, may be heard, rendered in the highest style of art, in many a meeting-house of the Denominations.

It is worth while to note these changes; for they portend and shadow forth the future. Much of the actual and prom-

ised developments of Ritualism have this intent ; no more. They have no theological significancy. They spring from the growing passion for the beautiful. If Roman Catholics had never placed lights on the Altar, our own Rectors might, probably, put them there with as little offense as flowers. And so of new forms and ceremonies : whatever heightens effect is likely to meet with favor ; the more so, if it have in it no repulsive sentiment, or use of a hostile Religion. And, we must expect to see such developments increase. They follow the spirit of the times. They spring from the prevailing taste of the people. It will be easier to regulate than to prevent them : and Religion ought not to exhibit herself as destitute of sympathy with the innocent tendencies of the age. If she does, she will lose her place of dominion. But, this does not imply the ministering to a false pride or vanity, or the modern love of self-indulgence. Much less should it be made the channel for introducing usages which are but the servile imitations of a corrupt Religion. Nor is it necessary. There is, indeed, no excuse for it. The region of Symbolism is so vast,—vast as the domain of Nature,—that we can find all pure and innocent forms of significance, without intruding into a territory where those forms have been marred by corrupt additions of doctrine and usage. Let us confine ourselves to the sober simplicity of our own Anglican Communion ; and, in our æsthetical progress, seek to chasten popular taste by those things in which Religion ministers to it ; while, on the other hand, we preserve her from the taint of a corrupt model of Ritualism. All that Rome has which is Catholic, is ours ; but, the purest and richest age of Symbolism was before Papacy rose.

There is, sometimes, a wonderful difference in the Worship of the Church, where there is no marked difference in form. Manners make the man ; and, we may almost say, Manners make the Service. At least, *this* is true :—the Worship of the Church is one thing, or a wholly different thing, in character and effect, according to the manner in which it is conducted. “ Shall we,” says South, “ in our applications to the great God, take that to be Religion, which the common reason of mankind will not allow to be manners ? ” There can be no

doubt, that many of our Clergy, and Laity too, in their fear of being superstitious, or of seeming so, are hardly decent in their demeanor in the House of God. Anything is good enough for Religion, provided there be the right spiritual affection. We know a Clergyman who has such a horror of reverence for the Altar and its Sacrament, that, in the act of Consecration, he faces half-way round to the people; and, at the laying on of the hand, gives a flippant touch to the Paten and the Cup; and there are lesser degrees of irreverence and slovenliness which, if not so shocking, are very exceptionable, as they are very common. The putting on of his Surplice, and, not unfrequently, the condition of the Surplice which he puts on, may show the animus of the Clergyman. If we had a *Clerical Directorium*, as we ought to have, this very act of arraying one's self in sacred vestments, for the solemn duties of the Sanctuary, were worthy to be accompanied by a silent Prayer, prescribed therefor.

And, in the Church,—why, we can almost wish well to the most extravagant Ritualists, when we see how the Service is often treated. First, bad reading, which would disgrace a schoolboy. Strange, that our Theological Seminaries take no more note of this than they do! Second, careless and irreverent reading, where the Clergyman seems to have no appreciation of the sacredness of the employment in which he is engaged. Third, monotonous reading, when Confession, Supplication and Thanksgiving, are all said in the same unvaried tone. Fourth, preaching-reading, where the Service sounds like a Methodist prayer-meeting. Fifth, affected reading; which reminds us of the comment of a Boston Paper, on the effusion of a certain Divine, on a special occasion:—"one of the most eloquent prayers ever addressed to a Boston congregation." And then, the postures and movements, and the whole air and demeanor of the Minister,—nothing reverent about them,—no sense of the proprieties of the place,—sometimes a scrupulous avoiding of reverence, lest it be misinterpreted,—no appearance of solemn awe,—gazing at the congregation,—putting one's elbows on the Altar, God's Table, in a manner for which he would chide his son, if he were to do the same thing on his



own table at home ; and, a thousand other indescribable slovenlinesses and breaches of propriety, which show that the man thinks anything is good enough for Religion, if one is only spiritually-minded.

The extreme Ritualist has this, at least, in his favor : his manners become the House of God. He realizes that it is a sacred place. He preserves the form of reverence, which is so essential to having the spirit of reverence. He believes, that too much attention cannot be given to one's conduct and demeanor in the Sanctuary. And, he makes his people reverential in *their* demeanor. We never see the power and greatness of little things more strongly illustrated, than in the difference of effect which manners in the Church create. It is too little thought of among us : and one reason is, that our people are so suspicious of signs of reverence. It is carrying them straight to Popery. They will see it in lowly kneeling ; in a marked bowing in the Creed, anything which goes beyond the "fashionable nod ;" in a reverent laying of the Alms, and of the Bread and Wine, upon the Holy Table ; in the careful handling of the sacred vessels ; in a sedate and devout manner ; in a slow and quiet movement, as if one felt that he was on holy ground ; in the hushed and awed administration of the consecrated elements ; in the "reverent eating and drinking of the same," after the Blessing ; and in everything else which shows, that the Minister has a deep sense of where he is, and what he is doing. We must be careful of these things ; for, extremes beget extremes : and if there are those among us who are inclined to run into unsanctioned forms and practices, it is, in great part, caused by a reasonable discontent with the prevailing habits of more of our congregations. We know this to be the fact ; for, we have talked with many of these Brethren, and we have seen their whole hearts in the matter. They do not believe, and no more do we, that the common habits of our Worship, in Clergy and Laity, are those which become a holy Place, or holy acts ; and, they will not admit, that they fairly represent the spirit or intention of the Church : nor do they. Hence, a seeking for better things. Hence, a desire to gather congregations in which better things may be

had. And hence, (as is natural in all reactions,) is a tendency in some to go beyond the modest middle way, which is the true position of our Church. And, we must add, they are as near right as are those of their Brethren from whom they most differ ; and, they are entitled to the same degree of toleration ; and, they will have it ; for no law, no authority, no equity, can prevent it.

And here we find, as we have already intimated, a true and just consolation, when we reflect upon the issues of these things, of this growing attention to Ritualism. The Tracts for the Times, in their day, were not without great evils. In some minds, their teaching budded into false doctrine. But, who can now deny, that the Religious movement which produced them, has wrought marvellous and most beneficent changes in the Church of England ? So here ; this new development in the æsthetics of Religion, which began across the water, and is now appearing here, may work, though it be attended with some excesses, as great and needed a reformation. Our Worship, (and, in that, we include all appointed Orders and Offices of the Church,) is not what it should be in practice ; and, as we have shown, our provision for the conduct of it is meager and unsatisfactory. We cannot go on always without a fuller *Directorium*. The new Ritualism will show the necessity for it. Its very existence proves that necessity. While, on the other hand, the efforts of zealous men to inaugurate a new style of associated devotion, will end, we hope and believe, in bringing us all, Clergy and Laity, up to the realization of the Worship of God, in the Beauty of Holiness.

## ART. V.—THE CHURCH: PURITANISM: THE FREEDMEN.

- (1.) *Reports, Sermons, Lectures, Addresses, &c., &c.*
- (2.) *Protestant Episcopal Freedmen's Commission Occasional Paper.* Jan. 1866. 8vo., pp. 28.

WE have before us, sent to us, for the use of, and some of them for publication in the Review, a mass of documents, printed and in manuscript, Sermons, Lectures, full and accurate stenographic Reports of Addresses never published, &c., &c., all of which go to prove a deliberate systematic determination and attempt to extend Puritanism into the South, and throughout the land, in connection with, and by means of, the present unsettled abnormal condition of the country. These documents we do not, for several reasons, deem it advisable to print, now. Their publication at the present time would only inflame the public mind, without perhaps subserving any really valuable end.

The main facts, however, which they disclose, belong to history, and should be preserved in connection with the stirring times through which we are passing. These documents show, that leading Puritans have attempted, and are now attempting, to impose Puritanism upon the South, and upon the country, a sort of Puritan Theocracy; an Institution as like as can be, in everything else but well-developed outward form—and hardly lacking that—to the System which Oliver Cromwell represented in England two centuries ago; and which the English nation, after a trial of twenty years, were but too glad to throw off, as an abominable tyranny, a thousand times worse than the Kingcraft from which they were promised deliverance. They have never cared to repeat the experiment. It is the proof of an attempt to extend Puritanism into the South, and to fasten it there, as an Institution, as a Religion, as a habit of thinking, as a philosophy, as a power, that we have before us.

Nor is the matter essentially changed by the fact that there is, in this country, no formal connection between Church and State. A late writer thus lays down the principle:—

"In every country, the policy of the Civil Government will be more or less directly pervaded by the prevalent Religious principle of the people. However loudly the formal union of Church and State may be denounced, there is, in fact, no form of Government in which the two are more closely allied than in a Democracy. The Religious sense of the nation enters into all its legislation, and unconsciously moulds it after its own model. Men may legislate wisely, and insert provisions in the grand constitutional charter, absolutely forbidding the State to manifest any sectarian preference in the public recognition of one Religious Society over another ; but, paradoxical as it may seem, the actual oneness of governmental policy with the prevailing tone of the popular Religion, is inevitable, especially in such a country as ours."

There are several questions connected with the late War, and with the present disturbed condition of affairs, which cannot yet be fully and fairly discussed. The time for calm discussion will come by and by. But they cannot and should not be altogether ignored, even now, for many reasons. In what respects was that War a Religious War ? To what extent do questions of a Religious and Denominational character hinder the return of National Peace, confidence, and prosperity ? Puritanism and Unitarianism, which are only different shoots on the same vine, and are one in their principles of Reform, and methods of working, are both trying to make capital out of the War. They have virtually avowed this design, and publicly, too, in their Conventions. They have identified themselves with the War, at every stage of its progress, and are straining every nerve now to shape and mould the form of its termination. In the Capitol, on political platforms, and in newspapers, they have put themselves forward on every possible occasion, and have sought to engage the public eye, as "the live men" of the age, and as "up to the times." "See," say they, "Our Christianity is no fossilized remains of musty Creeds and dead Orthodoxy. We have the genuine article for this nineteenth century." These modern empiricists are already much better understood than they suppose.

Now it is an unquestionable fact, that Puritanism at the North and a half-dozen leading Secessionists at the South, did, at the outset, play into each other's hands, in inflaming public feeling, and in inciting Civil War. So far as Slavery was in-

volved, as a moral and religious question, it is undoubtedly true, that in some quarters at the South it was justified as right, *per se*, right in principle. And yet, it is equally true that New England Puritans were, in the beginning, mainly instrumental, by their personal agency and by their votes, first in stealing and bringing slaves into the country, and then in fastening the institution upon it; and this too, against the remonstrance of Virginia and the Middle States. They only abolished it among themselves, when it ceased to be profitable. This much Mr. Greeley virtually admits in his "American Conflict;" and the facts themselves are capable of absolute demonstration.

So also in respect to the doctrine of State Sovereignty: If the Secessionists planted themselves upon it, in justifying themselves to their own consciences, and before the world, let it be remembered that the most extreme point to which that doctrine was carried at the South, was not a hair's-breadth beyond the ground taken again and again by Northern Puritans, in the previous history of the country, at a time when they had sectional and mercenary ends which they wished to gain. The proofs of this, also, are as clear as the day, and no intelligent man will deny them.

At the present time, however, the destruction of a cardinal fundamental principle in our Government, the Union of the States, is sought in an opposite direction; and few, we believe, are aware how near we have come,—and mainly through the influence of this same class of men,—to such a centralization of power in the hands of unconstitutional agencies and instrumentalities, as shall change the whole character of our Institutions. We have before us a report of a late "Sermon" in the Hall of Representatives by the Chaplain of the House, the Rev. Dr. Boynton, whose fiery rhetoric was only calculated to stir up the bitterest feelings against the entire South, and to prevent the reunion of the States. Here are extracts:—

"The war has left the South, alike a material ruin and a moral wreck. The ghastly emptiness, the black desolation of their land, filled only with scorched ruins and graves and dead men's bones, fitly represent the general state of the Southern mind and heart."

"They thought they could murder and torture and starve defenceless prisoners, and set about generally to a devil's work, and not become devils themselves."

"For the present, the South must remain incapable of an heroic or a great idea. The statesman may construct the forms of the State, but to reconstruct a ruined soul is beyond his art. The South has committed suicide upon her moral nature, and she must abide the result."

"She may produce cunning intriguers, wire-working politicians, or a fresh brood of conspirators, but with all this she will remain incapable of a noble thing; she will have no recovering life-power, no true manhood, because she rejects the right and the true, and obstinately clings to evil; and if she persists, she will certainly perish and disappear, and that beautiful land will be recovered by the power of the Northern life. The only choice which God has left the South is, repent or perish."

"By this revealing of the Southern spirit, we are brought face to face with some most solemn questions, and we should thank God that they are raised in time to enable us to decide them aright. Can we afford, by the wholesale pardon of these plotters and leaders of sedition, *by the restoration of their property and their political rights*, to declare, virtually, that they have done nothing worthy of punishment, and thus admit their plea that they owed allegiance to their States, and of course secession was neither treason or rebellion?"

This example of a preacher of the Gospel of Christ degrading himself into a partizan political demagogue, is but one instance of what has been, and still is, going on all over the North. In harmony with such teaching, the proposition has been made in Congress to expunge the very name, "The United States of America," and so to bring the whole country, in disregard of all those rights which belong to a Republic, under the power and dominion of a new party. Thank God, the Republic still exists; its hold upon the hearts of the people is as strong as ever; and it will vindicate its claim to be a tangible, living reality.

With this plan to prevent the reunion of the States, we have the effort already alluded to, to extend Puritanism into the South, and to fasten it upon that portion of the country. Such efforts are not even now abandoned. Puritan preachers have attempted,—as President Lincoln characterized it,—*"to run the Churches of the South;"*—a scheme which he effectually foiled,

whenever placed within his reach. These preachers, unmindful of what even Pagans hold sacred, the sanctity of Religious places and shrines, have thrust themselves into the consecrated Churches of Southern Christians, only to trample upon the holiest memories and tenderest sensibilities of the human heart. And all this has been chuckled and exulted over as a triumph ; and then these men have reported at home that the Southern people, thus goaded to desperation, "hate us Yankees as ladly as ever, and are not to be trusted."

A single example of this kind may be given as a specimen. A plan was lately formed and inaugurated, to establish a Puritan "Church," and Puritan Schools, for whites and blacks, in the City of Richmond, Virginia ; the very heart of the South, and, with perhaps a single exception, the most intensely Southern city on the continent. The attempt was to be made, under the protection of United States troops, and by the aid in part, indirectly, but not less effectually, of funds drawn both from the National treasury, and from public charities ; to which not a few nominal Churchmen have contributed. Providentially, and as it would almost seem, by a special interposition, this particular effort was unexpectedly thwarted. But the ground was carefully surveyed. Buildings for the experiment were selected,—and here the whole project was suddenly abandoned. All this was attempted, too, let it be remembered, after the War was formally closed ; and when every consideration which can appeal to the heart of patriotism, philanthropy, magnanimity, and Christian charity, should have dissuaded from such interference.

There is a serio-comic aspect in which this effort of the Puritan propagandist may be regarded, which, if daguerreotyped by Dickens, would make a funny picture. At present, not one of his characters fairly represents it. In the visit of the Puritan missionary to the Capital of Virginia, he seems to have caught a glimpse, of course from the outside, of the elegance, dignity, and refinement of character and manners, which have always graced society in that old State. Notwithstanding the vulgar taunts at the F. F. V.s, by snobs and parvenues, it has not been altogether by accident that Virginia has been the



Mother of Presidents, while New England has swarmed with clock peddlers and the venders of patent medicines.

There is no mystery in all this. It is the result of natural law. The religious element is the strongest of all elements in shaping the character of a people. The two leading ideas of New England Puritanism as a System, to wit : individual unconditional Election, and Independency in the form of Government, foster great individuality of character ; and all those traits which spring from, or admit of, such a form of Religious development, may exist under such conditions in a high degree of perfection. There may be persistence, even to dogged obstinacy. There may be tenacity of memory, and power of mental application, such as grows book-worms and scholars of a certain sort, and as can turn out books of any grade, from a Spelling-book to a Dictionary. There may be ingenuity, such as can construct anything, from a penny whistle to a steam engine. There may be thrift and economy, such as will amass and hoard a fortune. There may be imagination and fancy, within a limited sphere, and artistic culture. But all these cannot make Statesmen. Statesmanship is formed of nobler stuff, and grows on richer soil. It requires a reach of vision and breadth of sympathy which looks beyond the individual ; which regards man as a social being, linked, by the very constitution of his nature, in a bond of brotherhood with his fellow men. George Washington was a representative man. The Church theory which prevailed in Virginia, and the Puritan theory which prevailed in New England, formed two distinct casts of character. A shrewd friend of ours persists in maintaining that he can detect, at a glance, these types of character, even in the physiognomy of the individual.

We honor New England, for what she is, and for what she has done. We estimate her still higher, for what she has it in her power to do. There are nobler elements in New England even now, than those to which we have alluded ;—elements which, if diffused as they ought to be and as they may be, amid the prevailing wreck of their modern Creeds, would diffuse the leaven of a broad, generous Catholicity through the New England mind, and convert a clannish, narrow, mischiev-

ous sectionalism, into a genial, conservative principle in our national character.

Our Puritan adventurer at Richmond seems to have had good sense and sagacity enough to think it a question, whether, after all, the sharp-visaged nasal Pilgrims did really possess quite a monopoly of all the social virtues ; and as he was unexpectedly prevented from inflicting, by military force, his Puritanism upon these proud people ; and as the prospect presented itself, instead of playing the hero, of figuring in altogether another sort of *role*, and as the man at the White House at Washington happens to have a mind and will of his own, he found it entirely convenient to quit the field. Had he succeeded in carrying out his plans, it would, of course, have been a proud feather in the cap of the Roundhead, thus to plant his banners and wave his flag upon the very Gibraltar of the Cavalier.

The effect of all such Puritan intermeddling with the private affairs and personal responsibilities of the Southern people, is precisely what might be anticipated. The intensity of bitter alienation, which has taken deep root in the hearts of the prominent Religious Sects, North and South, it will require a whole generation to eradicate. A New England Puritan divine, who lately visited the South, thus publicly reported his experience.

"It is frequently remarked, that the Religious people at the South are more obstinate than any other class of people there ; and the Ministers are more obstinate than their congregations. \* \* \* We cannot coöperate with you, they say. Ask the Old School Presbyterian, or the New School, if they see the way open ? Ask any denomination, if you can approach them, on this matter ; and you will receive the same reply. There is no coöperation. \* \* They do not love us a bit better than they did in 1860 ; and why should we expect it ?"

The Presbyterian Synod of North Carolina, lately assembled at Fayetteville ; and among their official declarations was the following :—

"The guilt of Schism is not on us. We protest our desire for union, if it can be effected without a compromise of truth, and of our loyalty to Christ's crown and covenant. Those who may come among us to carry out the unscriptural and Schismatical purposes avowed by

the Old School Assembly of 1865, we reject and oppose, as enemies of the purity and peace of our churches; and declare solemnly before God that we will not and cannot recognize them officially, or by Ministerial intercourse or communion, as Ministers of the Gospel, so long as they maintain such an attitude, or attempt such conduct towards us."

The Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky, which met at Louisville, Oct. 11th, was the scene of a most shameful broil. The famous Rev. Dr. Breckenridge, who represented the Northern radical element, in alluding to the authors of the "Declaration and Testimony," declared; "they have, by that proceeding, put themselves in an Ecclesiastical status, which renders them unqualified and unfit and unworthy to sit in this or any other Church Court. \* \* \* There must be a closer coming together, or a wider separation between us and certain members of the Synod." Waxing warm in his angry debate, and adopting the language of the *duello*, he continued:—"I am not to be brow-beaten by any body—least of all by you. I am disposed to treat everybody like a gentleman, and when I do not, I am responsible in and out of the house."

The Presbyterian Synod of Nashville met at Huntsville, Ala., Jan. 18, 1866. In an official paper, they utter the following language:—

"In a portion of our Synod, lawlessness has been sadly prevalent. Some of our Ministers and many of our Church members have been driven from their houses, for no other reason than that their political sentiments were not pleasing to the mob. *We are sorry to say that some of the Missionaries of the Northern General Assemblies have excited and encouraged this lawless spirit.* Some of our churches have been utterly broken up by this persecution."

Among the Methodists and Baptists, the estrangement is equally decided and bitter. We will not quote from documents before us. It is a shameful exhibition of crimination and recrimination, each party talking loudly about its conscience, and foaming with passion, and each casting dishonor upon that Holy Name which they profess.

Now we do, here, most solemnly, and earnestly, protest against all this wanton interfering with the private, special duties and responsibilities of our Christian brethren at the South. Its only effect will be, to deepen and perpetuate ha-

treds which are already well nigh as bitter as they can be. Allowing that these sectional dislikes exist,—and they do exist,—there is a nobler and surer way to subdue them. If this “War of the Roses” is ever to terminate, and Lancaster and York are to merge their separate interests, and bury the past in one common grave, it will only be, when each shall strive which can show most of magnanimity and Christian love. Until then, let New England and Virginia, Round-head and Cavalier, each in their own sphere, be allowed to cherish their hereditary pride of ancestry, their religious opinions, their traditional prejudices even, if they will. As our National theory of the United States, of States in the Union, is the only one on which peace and prosperity are among the possibilities of the future, so also, among the bodies of professing disciples of Christ, there must be mutual respect and confidence, and the recognition of mutual rights, duties, and responsibilities.

There is no good reason conceivable, why these old sectional feuds should not now die out. The War, with all its horrible barbarities, is at an end, and Slavery, as an institution, is confessedly, constitutionally, and forever dead. As we said before the War again and again, we say now, this Nation can never be permanently divided. Whatever questions may claim to have been settled by the War as to the fundamental structure of our Government, the laws of Nature and of Providence render it absolutely certain, that as the American people are one in language, one in geographical distribution, one in their mutual dependence and material interests, so they must be, and will be one, in their Governmental organization. Surely it is the duty of the Ministers of Christ, and of Christians of all names and persuasions, that, so far as in them lies, this storm of passion and hatred shall now subside. To persist in stirring up the old fires, which, if enkindled, can only burst out in another still more terrible Civil War, to provoke to madness sectional variance, is not only unmanly and un-Christian, it is cruelty, and wanton wickedness, beyond the power of language to express.

It is cruelty to the blacks themselves. Puritan interference with the internal affairs of the South, where sectional hatred is

already so bitter, can only lead in the end to a War of Races ; and how such a war would terminate, it needs no prophet's eye to foresee. The weaker race will inevitably succumb, and eventually be exterminated. Already the records of mortality in the colored race are startling. At least one million of the negro race, according to the most accurate estimates, have perished since the beginning of the War ; and by the year 1870 it is supposed that two-fifths of the whole number will have been blotted from existence. We know very well that the leaders of the more developed School of modern Puritanism see nothing to regret in such a solution of this difficult question of races. Thus Herbert Spencer, in a late work, which our modern Reformers are endorsing and commending, says ;

" It seems hard, that an unskillfulness which, with all his efforts, he cannot overcome, should entail hunger upon the artisan. It seems hard, that a laborer, incapacitated by sickness from competing with his stronger fellows, should have to bear the resulting privations. It seems hard, that widows and orphans should be left to struggle for life or death. Nevertheless, when regarded not separately, but in connection with the interests of universal humanity, these harsh fatalities are seen to be full of the highest beneficence—the same beneficence which brings to early graves the children of diseased parents, and singles out the low-spirited, the intemperate, and the debilitated, as the victims of an epidemic." And this is the way in which " the stern discipline, which we see at work through all nature, is a little harsh that it may be very kind." \*

So also,

" In speaking of the entire class of " unfortunates," whether " widow and orphans in the distress of poverty and destitution, the sick and lame, the insane and idiotic," he says, let them alone and " they die ; it is best they should die ; " it is but a " part of that process " by which " nature is weeding out those of lowest development." In this way, as he holds, " nature is securing the growth of a race " which " shall both understand the conditions of existence and be able to act up to them."

We are not drawing upon our imagination when we say, that such a doom to the colored race as this, would not, in the estimation of this new School of Reform, be regarded in the light of a public misfortune. We have heard such inhuman

---

\* Social Statics, p. 354.

sentiments openly declared by some of the more extreme of this class of men. There is more of the old French Infidelity in this movement, both in its maxims and in its principles, than is generally conceived.

This is not Christianity. It is not Philanthropy, nor Patriotism. On the contrary, the whole body politic bleeding at every pore, society lacerated and torn, hearths desolate, widows and orphans houseless and homeless, villages in ashes, Churches of God in ruins—all these call upon us, and call upon all the people, to pour oil upon the troubled waters, to heal the terrible wounds which War has made, so far as they can be healed, to give forth from warm hearts and willing hands, words and deeds of conciliation and mutual kindness and goodwill. This we will do, so help us God. This is the blessed work to which the Church committed herself at her last General Convention; which she has done during the war; which she is still doing; and which she will continue to do. She has "let the dead bury their dead." She has rendered to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. Though, in the world, she has proved, and she will prove, that she is not of the world. Taunted with cowardice, arraigned before the public as a time-server, challenged by sneering infidelity as wanting in philanthropy, it is yet the dynamic influence of Christianity that has done all the real good that has been done; and the Church, in her own distinct sphere, and in her own way, will still go on conquering and to conquer. She is already a city on a hill; multitudes who were strangers to her are flocking to her courts, and the sons of strangers are building up her walls.

This late development of Puritanism, this grasping after power, this fighting the Lord's battles with carnal weapons, this ceaseless intermeddling with social rights to gain certain ends, is nothing new. It is a spirit springing naturally from the system itself.

A thorough and well-digested diagnosis of Puritanism, as it was originally, and as it is in its present stage of development, the nature of the thing itself, its infallible symptoms, its uniform influence upon the body politic,—would be a curious and

useful study. We shall not attempt to draw up such a paper here. Two characteristics, however, belong to it always, and everywhere. It claims to have a higher moral standard than other people ; and then, it claims, as its special vocation, to attend to the affairs of other people. As the specially "elect of God," "the chosen people," and surrounded by the Amorites, and Hittites, and Perizzites, it has its "mission." When it moves for conflict, and, as it is by profession a "reformer," it must, of course, be always on the move about something, it adopts as its watchword some "great moral idea," as it calls it, and makes it for the time being its shibboleth and stock in trade. How its theory of Reform differs from Christ's Apostolic Church theory, we are not now pointing out ; they do differ, radically, and fundamentally, and that difference vitally affects the question of all organic Government, the Family, the Church, and the State. All that we are aiming at now, is to show what its method of Reform is. Mr. Greeley, the representative and oracle of Modern Puritanism in such matters, in his "*American Conflict*," describing the early Puritans in this country, says :

"Their experience of Indian ferocity and treachery, *acting upon their theological convictions*, led them early and readily to the belief, that these savages, and, by logical inference, all savages, were children of the devil, to be subjugated, if not exterminated, as the Philistine inhabitants of Canaan had been by the Israelites under Joshua."

Here is the whole thing in a nut-shell. If, however, it should happen to be true, and it certainly is quite possible—for some things, such as virtue, and chastity, and charity, and true Religion, never vaunt—that these Puritans are simply mistaken in what they thus take for granted, if they are really no better than other people, and their noisy pretension to such superiority is no proof of its possession, for then the Chinese "Celestials," and the Utah "Saints," would bear the palm ; if, moreover, these modern Puritans are not, in any very peculiar sense, "the specially chosen and elect of God," then, of course, their conclusions drawn from such premises, would prove false, even as the premises themselves are false ; and, in this case, their perpetual interference in the affairs of their neighbors



would be but sheer impertinence ; and these self-boastful "reformers" would seem to rank as a class of restless busy-bodies and intermeddlers.

For the better class of the original Puritans, to whom, at the first, this name was given as a term of reproach, we have in certain aspects of their character and history, considerable respect. That man has no true reverence for goodness, who condemns these men unqualifiedly and without exception. In all the great questions which mark historical epochs, there are always two sides. There are two sides here. In that day of practical license and doctrinal laxity, when such a man as Dean Swift, who was hobnobbing with such a man as Bolingbroke, and caricaturing such a man as Robert Boyle, hoped to be a Bishop; when Archbishop Tillotson was denying the Eternity of Punishment, disparaging the Athanasian Creed, and preaching a cold Morality in the place of the Cross of Christ; in such a day, the Puritans laid hold of, and presented to the world, certain living truths and principles, however much these truths and principles were twisted, and narrowed, and perverted in their hands. Notwithstanding their cant and nasal twang, notwithstanding their sacrilegious and horrible trampling upon sacred places and things, notwithstanding their overstrained morality, which afterwards rebounded with such shocking results, notwithstanding the sheer hypocrisy, the self-will, the quenchless thirst for power, an ambition, whose motto seemed to be "rule or ruin," notwithstanding the sheer hypocrisy which, in not a few of their leaders, concealed the grossest moral delinquency behind a solemn sanctimonious visage—notwithstanding all this, there was among them real genuine sanctity, and their position was an honest, fearless protest against doctrinal and practical degeneracy.

The Puritans did not represent the best life of the English Church. In this respect, the greatest injustice has been done to the Church at that period. Puritanism then, and Wesleyanism a century later, were extreme developments of a great religious movement in the English Church, which reached the very heart and soul of the Establishment ; and the breadth and depth, and power of the current of Christian life were not

the less real, even though they lacked the noisy demonstration of shallower streams. Let it ever be remembered, also, that every living truth and principle which they represented, every true element of power which they possessed, and every lofty and commanding virtue which they exhibited, they inherited as their birth-right from the good old Mother Church of England, of which they were all members, and the better part of them ordained Ministers.

When these men came to the New World they brought with them their high estimate of Education. Not a few of them were thorough scholars. Thus, John Cotton spoke the Hebrew and Latin languages, the latter fluently, and wrote it elegantly, and read the Greek readily. They knew what Oxford and Cambridge had to do with England's greatness; and one of their first efforts here was to plant those two Institutions, Harvard and Yale, still the leading Colleges of the country. In this respect they were wise men. Would that Churchmen in this country, even now, understood the matter as well. They were not mistaken as to the source from whence the moving power of a people and a nation emanates. But the Puritans, in coming here, left the Church behind them; that Church, which a company of them, on setting sail from England, thus addressed:

"We desire you would be pleased to take notice of the principals and body of our company, as those who esteem it our honor to call the Church of England, from whence we rise, our dear mother; and cannot part from our native country, where she specially resideth, without much sadness of heart, and many tears in our eyes; but acknowledging that such hope and part as we have obtained in the common salvation, *we have received in her bosom, and sucked it from her breast.* We leave it not, therefore, as loathing that milk wherewith we were nourished there; but blessing God for the parentage and education, as members of the same body."\*

Sadly at variance with all this was the course of the Puritans on landing upon our shores; how sadly, this is not the place to describe. We do not think their conduct very surprising. They had been taught by old Rome that Bishops and

---

\* Hubbard's New England, pp. 126-7.

Priests were essentially of the same Order, that both were of Ecclesiastical origin and authority only, and that the Pope's authority was alone divine. The writings of the earliest Christian Fathers had been for centuries ignored, and were almost wholly unknown. The *renaissance* of learning had spread the knowledge and power of the Written Word, but had not as yet diffused the writings of the men who wrote or compiled that Written Word. The Forged Decretals, that stupendous magazine of abominable lies, had not yet been exposed, and were supposed to rest on the same authority that makes Bishops. It is not strange, that even the English Reformers sometimes stumbled and blundered at first, and that Mr. William Goode, and they who cite him as an authority, can prove almost anything from them that they wish.

The tribute of those old Puritans to the Mother Church of England, which we have just quoted, is also noteworthy, in that it shows how deserving she was of their confidence and affection as a system of Doctrine and Life. But here, in this New World, they determined to start a new Church for themselves. They proscribed the Church of England. They excluded and persecuted her. They renounced her Ministry and Worship. They created, or attempted to create, a Church and Ministry and Worship. In place of the old Faith of the Primitive Creeds, they substituted John Calvin's philosophical dogmas. What the result of all this has been, we need not here repeat. Their modern Creeds are abandoned, and with them have gone the essential doctrines of the Faith of Christ ; and, in their stead, has been developed a Rationalism, whose daring impieties and horrible blasphemies, are known and read of all men. In forsaking the Church which Christ constituted, and as He constituted it, alas for them, that Church was "the pillar and ground of the Truth."

Politically and Socially, Puritanism has not worked successfully, even in its best estate. Oliver Cromwell illustrated the spirit of Puritanism, when he tried to convert, or to conquer Ireland ; and, in the attempt, was guilty of atrocities, even the reading of which, makes humanity shudder, and the blood curdle with horror. Ireland has never forgotten the lesson.

The Puritans exhibited the genuine spirit of the system in Holland, where the Dutch Clergy pronounced them, as the historian says, "a set of discontented, factious, and conceited men, with whom it would be safest to have no connection." And their own explanation of the reason for leaving a country, where, for eleven years, they had had every liberty that they could desire, was, that "*inasmuch as in ten years time, whilst we sojourned among them, we could not bring them to reform anything amiss among them!*"

We shall not trace the political history of Puritanism in this country. It began its career, as we have already said, as a politico-religious establishment, forced itself upon the people by the most arbitrary and unjust laws, and proscribed all other forms of Faith by Statutes written in blood. It consented to Toleration, at last, not gracefully, and only from sheer necessity. Some of the old pæans about "Freedom of Conscience," which it used to sing on "Forefather's-day," have been shamed into silence; and some of the old libels upon the English Church, and our own, which used to disgrace our Histories and School-books, and which were taught to our children at our own expense, have at last been given up. But its restless, intermeddling, grasping spirit seems to be still alive. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. All that we have attempted now, has been to shew that it has sought, and is still seeking, amidst and by means of the present distracted condition of the country, to force itself upon uncongenial soil; and where both the men and the measures are alike held in intense dislike; and where such interference in the relations which subsist between the two races, if persisted in, will assuredly end in mischief, and only serve to hinder the return of National Union, peace and prosperity.

Directly at variance, and in open contrast, with all this, is the manner in which the Church is entering upon the work to which she is called by events of the times. To invite special attention to this work, and to the principles on which it is conducted, to show how those principles differ from the principles and policy of certain active organizations about us, is the object of our present paper. That work is indicated by the "Occasional Paper" at the head of this Article. It is worthy of the con-

fidence and support of all Christian men ; and the method which it proposes to pursue is the only one by which real and permanent good can be effected, amid difficulties so peculiar and delicate in their character. How, and why this is so, we think has been already shown in our previous pages.

The Church recognizes Southern Christians as members with us of the One Body of Christ. She recognizes, also, the special duties and responsibilities which belong, first of all, to the appointed leaders of the Church of God at the South. She takes for granted, that, as Christian men, they know what those duties and responsibilities are ; and especially to the destitute and degraded population around them. Northern Churchmen ask to co-operate with their Southern brethren in this great work, and to share their burdens. They know that the welfare, the very existence of the colored race requires that the kindest relations shall exist between the two classes ; and that the two races must live side by side in harmony, or that one or the other must perish.

Our brethren at the South understand this whole subject in all its bearings, and are alive to its magnitude and pressing importance. Leading Bishops and Clergy, Ecclesiastical Conventions, public bodies, clerical and lay, have given official expression to sentiments which cover the whole ground, and which, in their scope and spirit, are all that Christianity and philanthropy can suggest or desire. Measures have been instituted for the intellectual, moral, and spiritual training of the colored population, such as shall fit them for their new duties and responsibilities. Our brethren at the South invite our aid, in the same confidence with which it has been proffered. It is a great and glorious work. It appeals only to Christian feelings, and uses only Christian motives and methods. It blends the sympathies, and unites the hearts of brethren. It is a work of love, and so it is Christlike, Godlike. It will tend to bind together the most distant sections of our country, by the strongest of all bonds, mutual affection and confidence. It is only by such ties as these, not by standing armies, that, by the very nature and genius of our Institutions, the body politic can be one, in its future progress of national power and glory.

Besides all this, it is the work of regenerating Africa brought to our own doors, without its romance, and without its terrible fatalities. It is the work of training up Missionaries of the Cross, and messengers of Christian Civilization, who shall go forth to do that for Africa, and in Africa, for which Nature and Providence have specially fitted them ; and which mission to their own native land we believe to be one of God's great and wise purposes in their past history in our own.

NOTE.—Since the above was written, the following language from the Rt. Rev. Bishop McIlvaine, of Ohio, in a speech at Detroit, Mich., has been published:—

“ Bishop McIlvaine said that no subject could be of more importance to the Church than that of affording relief to the Southern clergy. They all knew how decided had been his stand during the war, but through all, and especially now in their misfortunes, he entertained the kindest feelings toward his brother clergymen of the South. His heart had been stirred in him by the distressing facts which he had just heard, and by similar ones which he had learned through other sources. He wished the Domestic Committee to send agents to canvass the whole Church for relief, believing that they would meet with great success, and be attended with the most blessed results. *He would like to stand by the agent in every parish and help him with all his might.* He considered the union of the Church the great thing to be accomplished, and the more we show that we are laborers with them, the more will be accomplished. *He said that we cannot hope to supply the Spiritual wants of the South by sending agents there from the North. In fact we could do nothing in that way, but we must work through those who are already there. We must help them on their feet and render them all the assistance in our power.*”

## ART. VI.—SCHWEINITZ ON THE MORAVIAN EPISCOPATE.

*The Moravian Episcopate.* By EDMUND DE SCHWEINITZ, Pastor of the Church at Bethlehem, Pa. Bethlehem: Moravian Publication Office. 1865. 12mo., pp. 28.

Our reprinting of Perceval on the pretensions of the Moravians to the Apostolic Succession, seems to have stirred up that very respectable denomination very considerably. In addition to various little skirmishings in the way of abuse, they now come forward with their proofs. The Rev. E. De Schweinitz, pastor of the Church at Bethlehem, gives the above pamphlet as the argument in favor of the Apostolic Succession of the Moravians.

Our readers will remember, that the especial pinch was in the case of "Stephen, Bishop of the Waldenses," who is asserted to have given them the Episcopacy. Who was he? And who gave the Episcopacy to him? These questions Mr. De Schweinitz answers in this way:—

"In their native valleys of Piedmont, the Waldenses were never an Episcopal but always a Presbyterian Church. The best authorities prove this, and the most recent discoveries of Waldensian documents in the University Library of Cambridge and elsewhere serve to corroborate it. To teach, as has been frequently done, that the Italian Waldenses had a succession of Bishops stretching back to the Apostles' times, and independent of that perpetuated through the Roman Catholic Church, is treading upon most unhistoric ground. In no way can such a position be established. As early as the first quarter of the fifteenth century, however, we find Waldenses in Bohemia, and their ecclesiastical development was wholly different from that of their brethren in the valleys. Paul Stransky, a Bohemian historian of the seventeenth century, says that they were expelled from the South of France, came by way of Germany to Bohemia, and settled near Saatz and Laun." (pp. 12, 13.)

That is to say, the Waldenses always were Presbyterians up to the time of the Apostles. But they got the Episcopacy quite providentially for the sake of the Church of the Moravians.



"Providentially, there lived on the Moravian frontier a colony of Waldenses, with two Bishops who had received the legitimate consecration. Of these Bishops the senior was Stephen; the name of the other is not known. To them a deputation was accordingly sent, composed of Michael Bradacius, theretofore the principal Minister of the Brethren, and two other of their Priests." (p. 12.)

We shall find, by and by, that they were ordained by Roman Catholic Bishops!

Now, here is the statement.

"The Calixtines lent a willing hand, and upon their recommendation two Waldenses, Frederick Nemez and John Wlach, were ordained priests, on the 14th of September, 1433, in the Slavonian Convent of Prague, by Bishop Nicholas (Philibert), a Legate of the Council of Basle!! In the summer of the following year (1434), these two Priests were sent to Basle, where the Council was at open variance with the Pope, and in a full Convocation of Clergy consecrated Bishops by Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church!!! It was done again at the instance of the Calixtines and out of regard for them, the Council being anxious by all possible means to obtain their confidence. Thus the Bohemian Waldenses obtained the Apostolical Succession!!! and Bishop Stephen and his colleague, who had been consecrated by Bishops Nemez and Wlach, could legitimately transfer it to the Brethren." (p. 14.)

Here is the authority.

"For this account of the origin and validity of the Bohemian Waldensian Episcopate, the following are the direct authorities:—1. A 'Narrative of the origin of the Unitas of the Brethren,' in the Lissa Folios, written in the year 1605, and probably by Bishop Jaffet. It gives facts and dates as we have presented them above, and that under circumstances forming a most indisputable guarantee of their correctness. For, as clearly appears from internal evidences, this narrative was one of the controversial writings with which the Bishops of the Brethren were, at that time, officially meeting the assaults of Wenzel Sturm, a learned and cunning Jesuit, who tried his utmost to render the Unitas Fratrum—no longer an obscure community but a powerful Church—contemptible in the eyes of his countrymen, by disparaging, amongst other things, its Ministry. Consequently, if this account of the origin of the Bohemian Waldensian Episcopate had not been authenticated beyond all doubt, the Bishops would not have ventured to base upon it their refutation of Sturm's charges, as he might at once have proven it false, which he never attempted to do." (p. 15.)

That is to say, a narrative written in A.D. 1605, "probably by Bishop Jaffet," is sufficient proof that, in A.D. 1433, a

Legate of the Roman Catholic Church ordained, as Priests, two Waldenses, condemned as heretics by the Law of the Roman Catholic Church! and, more extraordinary still, that, in A.D. 1434, they were consecrated Bishops in a full Convocation of the Clergy, by Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church!!! And this is told us, in a narrative apparently anonymous, one hundred and seventy years after!! Mr. De Schweinitz calls this "the direct testimony of an original document." p. 15. What idea he can have of the value of testimony, or even of what the phrase "an original document" means, we cannot see. However, he requires us to accept this evidence as peremptory. We say plainly, that in the estimate of the Roman Catholic Church of that date, the Waldenses were heretics. We say, also, that in A.D. 1433, that Church had rules and forms of Ordination, which the Waldenses could not, as anti-Papal, and anti-Episcopal, accept! We say, also, that a "Legate" should ordain them, and *then Roman Catholic Bishops Consecrate them in a full Convocation!* are so extraordinary assertions, that they require "original documents," *real records, and direct evidence*, which is not given by Mr. De Schweinitz.

In regard to Orders, the English Church gives real documents. The registers at Lambeth, with regard to Parker's Consecration, have names, dates, everything. These are "original documents." We know where they have been since the first. They were made at the time. They are of authority. Any one can see the difference at once.

We must be excused, therefore, from believing this Consecration until *bonâ fide* records are produced. For, upon turning to Gieseler's Church History (Vol. iii, p. 184), we find, that there are, both published and in manuscript, profuse records of the Council of Basle, in Mansi's Collection of the Councils, also in seven volumes of MSS., in Paris, and much also in the Library of Basil. Here, then, is the source from which we ought to have records of such a fact as this, if there be any records! We recommend our Moravian brethren, when they assert that "Waldenses were consecrated by Roman Catholic Bishops at the Council of Basil," to search the acts and

records of the Council, to give us the documents that testify to the fact, if it ever took place. The Council of Basle was bold enough, as against the Pope. If they really ordained two Waldenses in a public Convocation, they had it recorded. Let us see the records. The English Church gives us real records of Consecration, as against Rome, so that Roman Catholics, like Dr. Lingard, acknowledge them. Let us have the records here.

Next, we have Palacky in his history of the Bohemians.

"Palacky, who, in his '*Geschichte von Böhmen*' (vol. vii, p. 492) says, treating of the Bohemian Waldenses:—'The narrative given in an old manuscript, is not improbable, namely, that in the autumn of 1433 Bishop Philibert, as Legate of the Council of Basle, ordained Waldensian Priests in the Slavonian Convent of Prague, of whom several, it is said, were in the following year (1434) elevated, at Basle, even to the dignity of Bishops. For it is possible that such an act, just at that time, was meant as an example and encouragement for the Bohemians, that they might be the more ready to agree to the Compactata of the Council.' " (p. 15.)

Now, we simply ask, is not this "old manuscript," "the Narrative written in 1605" of the Lissa Folios? Is not Palacky's evidence simply *an opinion*, "that he does not think it improbable;" and really no evidence at all?

Thirdly, we have Gindely;

"Who, in his '*Geschichte de Böhmischen Brüeder*' (vol. i. p. 37), describing the acts of the Synod of Lhota, says:—'It may on this occasion have become known to the Brethren that the (Bohemian) Waldenses of that day claimed a valid Episcopate, and they certainly knew that their superintendents made use of the Episcopal title. In particular did they hear of Stephen, the head of these Austrian Waldenses, who was said to have been consecrated by a Waldensian Bishop that had, in 1434, himself received consecration at the hands of a Roman Catholic prelate—a statement which the Calixtines of Bohemia pronounced correct.' " (p. 15.)

"It may have become known," he says, "that the Waldenses claimed a valid Episcopate." Mr. Gindely is no more certain than Mr. Palacky. Has he any other evidence than the Lissa Folios?

Now, we simply say to the American Church, here are the Moravians claiming an Episcopacy—that is to say, when they

can make an advantage of it, from the Church of England, or our own. The first, and most important point, is the *proof* of this Ordination of Waldenses in full Convocation at the Council of Basle. Let us have this clearly proved, as Parker's Consecration is proved, by records, produced, examined and verified. This, we say, they have not done. They have not pretended to do it. Let it be done, before our Clergy go forward and recognize them on the bare word of Nicholas Count Zinzendorf.

We think that this, at least, is due to the Church. With the evidence already laid before Churchmen, as to the Ecclesiastical character of the Moravians, the doctrinal teachings of Zinzendorf, and the practical workings of the Moravian system, before any individual clergy of our Church shall recognize the Moravians, the Church herself should pass upon their pretensions. And we know no better way, than for our General Convention to refer the whole question to the English Convocation for examination and settlement. In the meantime, we simply say, that our opinion of the character of the Moravians, as a Church validly constituted, which was grievously shaken by Perceval's Tract, is by no means rehabilitated by the pamphlet of Mr. DeSchweinitz. We have simply trenched upon one point of his argument, because that is enough ; although there are many more which we might have discussed. If the neck be cut through, the body can hardly live.

## ART. VII.—THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1865.

THE General Convention of 1865 must always hold a conspicuous place in the annals of the Church in these United States. It met at an important crisis in the history of the country and of the Church, and had to dispose of problems, weighty and momentous in themselves ; its action upon which, wise or unwise, would involve vital questions of principle and of policy, and tell upon the religious and the civil interests of the country for years to come ; perhaps, for all coming time. We say, upon the *civil* interests of the country ; for, though the Protestant Episcopal Church is not, numerically, a very large body, its wide diffusion, the large amount of wealth, intelligence and culture, and of all the elements of influence which it embodies ; its staidness, sobriety, calmness, and the spirit of order, obedience and steadfastness which pervade it, give it an importance and a power beyond its comparative numbers. Its action is known to be the action of enlightened and reflecting men ; its decisions the fruit of thought, of reflection, of deliberation, of patient inquiry and examination.

Under the pressure of this feeling, and a sense of the high responsibility in consequence resting upon them to the Church, to the country, and to God, the members of the late General Convention came together in Philadelphia ; and the impression visibly rested upon it during its whole protracted session. A quiet earnestness, a solemn purpose of heart, a thoughtful dignity, and, above all, as the source of these, a lively consciousness of religious faith and obligation, characterized its proceedings in an unusual degree. There have been moments in other General Conventions when the presence of God has been more vividly felt ; but no General Convention, in which that presence has been more constantly recognized, or its aid and guidance more steadily and earnestly sought. It, and its blessed fruits, we have reason to think, were graciously and richly vouchsafed.

Whatever other special thought each member of the late General Convention came charged with, there was one thought present to the minds of all, and in most minds paramount, the restoration of the Church's Unity. A thought in so many minds, uppermost in so many, must soon become articulate, would speak itself out, could not fail to make itself heard. There was no purpose of silence, no compact of silence, that could keep it silent. When men had come together, and looked one another in the face, in thought before aught was audibly said, they were saying to one another, For what are we come hither? And soon, if a man had the gift of utterance, "the fire kindled, and he spake with his tongue." "For the divisions of Reuben there were great thoughts of heart,"—"great searchings of heart."

It greatly facilitated the solution of the problem, otherwise so troublesome, that the Church had never recognized a breach in her Unity. The Church had never said, We are two; and therefore she had no such saying to unsay. She had no conditions to impose, no preliminaries to settle, no forms of reconciliation to exact. She had ignored the separation from the beginning, considered it and treated it as invalid and null, an act in its own nature futile and ineffective. Hence it followed that her best action was no action; and there was no other that could have been either so easy or so effectual. If there had been vacant places in her great Council, they had been vacant only by a laches; and if they were again filled, they who filled them were in them, not by virtue of a vote, an invitation, a permission, a condonation, or a treaty, but in their own right, in the use of a privilege which they had suffered for a time to fall into disuse, but which had all along remained perfect and unimpaired; which had never been forfeited or destroyed, but had been quietly waiting for reoccupation by its rightful owners. And to every such occupant, the beaming eye and the extended hand of Christian love and brotherly fellowship told more eloquently than any words, oblivion of the past, welcome in the present, hope for the future. If her children, in their fancied independence, had put on its airs and assumed its functions, by taking on them the form and offices of a distinct organi-

zation, she knew nothing of it in her corporate capacity. What they had done was to her as though it had been undone.

Nothing could, in our opinion, have more signally vindicated the wisdom of the Convention of '62, in abstaining from all violence and vituperation, from all sentences of excision or suspension, from putting forth any ban, setting up any barrier, than the happy result in '65; by means of which the transiently separated streams of ecclesiastical life were left free to flow together as gently mingling waters, no trace of the severance remaining to disfigure or weaken their subsequent onward course. The Church, by her divine instinct, knew that her strength was to sit still; and she sat still, and God did for her, what she could never have done so well for herself; while other religious bodies have found the task insurmountable; or even, in their low and unchurchly estimation of the principle of Unity, have neglected to essay it.

One grave act of the Southern portion of the Church in its temporary alienation and assumption of organic power, called, however, for some more definite notice and action. Into the place of the loving and saintly Bishop Cobbs, the Diocese of Alabama had chosen the Rev. Richard Hooker Wilmer, D. D., a man of good report among all the Churches; and the Southern Bishops, acting on their presumed supremacy, had proceeded to consecrate him. The validity of the act was indisputable; and its irregularity, on the ground maintained by the Church, equally clear. The act of Consecration had, by its intrinsic force, made him a true Bishop; and, as a Presbyterian of the Church of the United States, consecrated by Bishops of the same, a Bishop *in* that Church. But no compliance with the Canonical provisions applicable to the case, had made him Bishop of Alabama. His exercise of Episcopal jurisdiction in that Diocese was unauthorized, however he and his immediate associates, viewing the subject from their standpoint, might choose to regard it. For this difficulty, which alone stood in the way of a cordial reconciliation, the wisdom that is profitable to direct, as it always will when men on opposing sides act toward each other in justice and in love, found an easy solution. The House of Bishops prescribed, as the



condition of his recognition as Bishop of Alabama, his assent to the "Promise of Conformity to the Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church," made by our Bishops at the time of their Consecration, to be certified to the Presiding Bishop.

The Lower House, as we think, judiciously, added some formalities, for the purpose of making the act more solemn and impressive; and the Bishops assented to the change. The requirement has since been carried into effect by the Bishop of Alabama, in a very ample and generous fashion, publicly in Trinity Chapel, in the City of New York, in the presence of the Bishops of Connecticut, New York and Texas, with the administration of the Holy Communion. So the Bishop of Alabama is now numbered among our Diocesan Bishops, and stands in his lot with his brethren in the charge of the Household of Faith; and the only serious stumbling-block in the way of our godly union and concord, is mercifully taken out of the way. Nor must we,—whatever we may think of the original ground of offence, and while to some it will seem a needless scrupulosity, and to others wear the look of an evasive quibble,—withhold from Bishop Wilmer the meed of respect and praise for his manly resistance of military usurpation, and its intrusion into the sphere of the Church's spiritual authority. We do not recognize the right of any secular power, military or civil, to order the Ministers of Christ to pray for rulers, or a particular ruler; though it may justly silence and punish one whose prayers for rulers involve a denial of allegiance to the powers that are rightfully over him. This it may do, not as possessing the right of interfering with Public Worship, but as clothed with power to punish all acts in their nature treasonable or disloyal, whensoever and wheresoever done. For the vindication of this principle, we thank the Bishop of Alabama; and we wish him good luck in the name of the Lord.

The conciliatory and emollient course of the General Convention towards the alienated Dioceses of the South, has proved productive of the best results. The returning Bishops and Deputies carried home with them grateful impressions of the kindness and courtesy they had experienced, and by their

reports to their brethren, allayed all fear of severity, or of the imposition of harsh and degrading terms of reconciliation. The hand of friendship and of welcome has been eagerly and warmly grasped. "The General Council" has held its final session. Diocese after Diocese has signified its return to its old allegiance. The Freedmen's Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church has entered upon its work of love, and has everywhere been cordially received, and recognized as an acceptable auxiliary. The uninterrupted flow of ecclesiastical life and fellowship is again felt from one end of the land to the other. And they who live to behold another General Convention, will see Jerusalem at unity in itself, compacted together; and when the Tribes again come up to the testimony of the Lord, there shall not be one Tribe wanting.

In connection with this subject, we must not omit the discussion, by far the most earnest and excited of the Session, which arose upon the Resolution sent down to the Deputies from the Bishops, in favor of a public Thanksgiving to Almighty God for the restoration of peace to the country and to the Church. In the House itself, the debate was conducted with warmth and energy; but never with more than slight departures from decorum and charity; nor ever engendering more than a transient displeasure in the sharp collision of conflicting views: but in the world without, and especially among those who would make the Church of God subservient to worldly and political ends, both in the opinions expressed by individual speakers, and in the judgment rendered by the votes of the majority, it was made the subject of unfriendly criticism and rancorous abuse. Believing, as we do, that the decision of the Convention was wise, and consistent with its whole course in regard to the delicate subject with which the Thanksgiving stood connected, we wish once more, in behalf of the Convention, to repudiate and disavow the unjust and injurious imputations which have been grounded on the action of the Convention, and lavishly put forth in regard to that body, and to the Church at large. The refusal of Convention to express in formal and explicit terms its gratitude to God for the reestablishment of the national authority over the whole territory

of the United States, and the extinction of domestic servitude, has been popularly taken as an indication of disloyalty, and sympathy with the Southern rebellion, in that body, and in the Church which it represented ; and opprobrious epithets without stint have been heaped upon its action, both in the Church itself, by those who have either ignorantly or wilfully misrepresented the issue, and in the outside world.

Time has now given the passions and prejudices of men opportunity to subside, and calmer and juster views have found their way into men's minds. We are writing after an interval of some months, and feel the comfort and relief of the corrective process which that interval has wrought. In the minds of the majority, then, the question was not in the smallest degree a question of loyalty, of the War, of the measures of Government, or the merits of the "peculiar institution ;" but merely of what it was becoming and profitable for the Convention to do, constituted as it was, and in the existing condition of the Church. The whole subject was so ably and conclusively discussed in the printed Letter of the Bishop of Pittsburgh, that, to those who took the trouble to read it, little more needs to be said. General Convention was a healer, "a repairer of the breach, a restorer of paths to dwell in." It was to do that which would *heal*, and not that which, in derogation of its office, would hinder or defer healing. It was to provide a Form of Thanksgiving, in which, if possible, all its members could unite,—one sufficiently comprehensive and general in its terms, to give ample vent to the feelings of those who counted the subjugation of the South and the extinction of slavery, blessings, and not to compel those whose souls were sore and smarting with a sense of discomfiture and loss, either to make a show of themselves openly, by absenting themselves from the Service, or seem to unite in sentiments to which their hearts were strangers. It was not courteous. It was not generous. It was not Christian. It was not right. Large numbers of men in that body, hating rebellion, disliking slavery as cordially as the noisiest declaimer on the floor, thought they knew what, nevertheless, was due to themselves and to their companions, as Christians and as gentlemen, and acted accordingly.

For, it is worthy of notice, that almost every one who had suffered for the cause of the country, whose loyalty had cost him anything, was found in that majority. And it is quite possible that some vociferous advocates of a different course, would have been equally vociferous rebels, if their lot had fallen to them where rebellion was popular. The cheap loyalty of talk is a poor thing in comparison with the genuine loyalty of suffering and self-denial.

The wisdom of Convention, we think, has been amply justified by the result. All who would, praised God for just as much as they chose, in the broad language of the Bishops' Service. The sound went through the land with an attractive and healing influence. Southern hearts responded to the generous and forbearing strains. Opposition melted before love. Prejudice was dispelled and removed. We have come together again, and once more we are one. "Neither shall they learn war any more."

The Missionary operations of the Church, the work of Church Extension, in one or another of its forms and adjuncts, occupied a larger space than usual in the doings of the Convention, and took the place of much labor, which has hitherto been devoted to the business of legislation. Of this, not much was done. The time, we trust, has gone by, when Canon-making is to be the main occupation of our great triennial assemblies, and the Journal little else but a magazine of Canons,—some a dead letter, some of little practical use, and some so ambiguously expressed, or so incongruously piled together, that the true intent of the law is not easily ascertained. A few Canons of obvious utility were enacted, and order taken for a reissue of the Digest, to embrace and codify the legislation of the Church, as it now stands.

But nobler aims and objects are now opening themselves to the Church; and, as we believe, a spirit is growing up in her, which will meet and answer these calls. The meetings of the Board of Missions ran parallel to those of the Convention, continued to its close, and were scarcely inferior to it in importance or in interest. Those who listened to Bishop Coxe's noble defence of the Greek Mission, must feel, that, aside from

the cogency of its arguments, as a specimen of Christian eloquence, it has rarely been equalled. That Mission has been fully vindicated and sustained, and its venerable head, it may be hoped, will, ere long, be cheered by the presence and aid of like-minded helpers. The place of the lamented Bishop Boone was filled, by the election of the Rev. Channing Moore Williams, now a Missionary in Japan, to be his successor. The African Mission vindicated its long established place in the heart of the Church, and an arrangement was completed, by which the Liberian Church, when it pleases, may effect for itself an independent organization ; a measure, which, whether wise in itself, or otherwise, is rendered expedient by the restlessness of the Liberian Clergy.

The presence of the Bishop of Honolulu, and his simple and interesting statements of the condition of Christianity in the Hawaiian kingdom, though not directly connected with the business of the Board, were so cognate to it as to harmonize wholly with the spirit and object of its labors. New views of the people, and of their religious state and wants, of the position of the Church among them, and of the need of our assistance in order to the extension of its privileges and blessings, were presented to many minds. As an additional instance of intercommunion with the Mother Church, his visit, as well as that of the Bishop of Montreal and the deputation from Canada, was opportune and gratifying. The latter Prelate did us the favor of preaching the Sermon at the opening of the Convention. And in the venerable Prolocutor, we welcomed one whose name had long been a household word among us, and whose Catechetical instructions had rendered valuable aid in training successive generations of our children.

The need of our great and rapidly expanding country, occupied much of the time both of the Convention and of the Board of Missions. The growing want and work are almost appalling, and well nigh paralyze effort by their magnitude. The luminous expositions of Bishop Talbot, with the aid of a map, opened to many minds novel ideas of the land we inhabit, and aided a little towards giving reality and location to names, which before had no definite significancy. The late brave and

laborious Bishop of the North West having retired from the field he had so admirably tilled, to be the Assistant Bishop of Indiana, a successor to him was appointed, and two others were added, thus increasing the number of Missionary Bishops from two to four. Of the three, one has declined the appointment, and the other two have been set apart to their important work by the laying on of hands. This is a most valuable accession to the missionary force in the domestic field, and will doubtless give a fresh impulse to the Church's progress. Yet, it is most inadequate. If one will but think what vast territories, what spreading populations, what untold and unimagined resources, are covered by the phrase "parts adjacent," which hangs as a pendant to the titles of these overtaxed and overburdened men, he cannot fail to feel how far behind her work she is in her boldest and most extended efforts, and how much need there is to pray continually, that God would raise up His power and come among us, and with great might succour us ; and that whereas through our sins and wickedness we are sore let and hindered in running the race that is set before us, His bountiful grace and mercy may speedily help and deliver us through the satisfaction of His Son our Lord.

And this leads us to express our regret that a Prayer to the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers into His harvest, either in the form of a new suffrage in the Litany, or in some other shape, had not been inserted in the Prayer Book by the General Convention. In the Lower House, a vote in favor of it in the former shape was carried almost by acclamation, with a quite unwonted unanimity and enthusiasm ; and it was a sad disappointment to many hearts that the somewhat, as it seems to us, over strenuous conservatism of the Bishops defeated the measure. We yield to none in love and admiration of the Prayer Book as it is ; and we are not at all inclined to innovation. But we confess that we have no sympathy with that iron conservatism which will keep the Church forever destitute of that which the united voice of the Church declares to be desirable, for what we feel tempted to call the childish fear that somebody will take advantage of its admission to foist in that which we should not like, or expunge that which we do.

When we consider the many safeguards which the Church has thrown around the integrity of the book, with what difficulty and deliberation every change in it must be effected, it does seem to us that such fears are groundless and chimerical. And we venture to hope that ere long they will give way to a sounder and more reasonable conservatism; and that "keeping the happy mean between too much stiffness in refusing, and too much easiness in admitting, variations in things once advisedly established," we may have the Prayer in question, a Prayer for Missions, for Travellers by land, for the interests of Education, and be allowed to use in Church the Commendatory Prayer for a person at the point of death, and not be compelled to pray for his restoration, when it is simply asking for a miracle.

Missionary effort, too, was drawn into a new channel by one of the great results of the late War in the extinguishment of negro slavery. That it may be a blessing to those whom it has suddenly elevated from bondage to the rank of freemen, all the appliances of Christian wisdom and benevolence must be put in requisition. To speak unkindly of any honest effort for the good of these people, should be far from any Christian heart. But the Church of God cannot but feel that its duty is not done by aiding in promiscuous efforts that can afford no sufficient guaranty of the soundness of their doctrinal, moral or social teachings, and that may be abused to the purposes of a licentious unbelief, or an incendiary fanaticism. The Church of God must do her own work in her own way. For this purpose she has instituted a Freedmen's Commission of her own, as an additional branch of her Missionary executive, to coöperate, by agents and missionaries of her own, with Southern pastors and Christians, in the mental and religious improvement of this deeply necessitous and interesting class, as well as by pecuniary and other contributions to alleviate and supply their temporal wants. And surely, whatever men may think of slavery or emancipation, or of this or that political man or measure, the simple fact, indisputable however occasioned, that such a description of people, so numerous and so needy, exists in our country, should be a reason imperative, conclusive with all true Christians and patriots within our



spiritual pale, to come to the Church's aid in this wise scheme of Christian benevolence.

Not widely separated from this great subject of Missionary work, and Church Extension, is the Provincial System ; which occupied, and as we think, not fruitlessly, though without definite result, much time in the House of Deputies. The necessity of such a System in some form, as an ultimate result, no thinking Christian can well deny. To precipitate it prematurely, would doubtless be an evil. To provide for it in due season when the need of it begins to press, is a mere prudent forecast. To be a safe and healthy thing it must be a growth, and not the mechanical creation of theorists. That the time for it has come in any extended development, we do not at all believe. But that certain preliminary work looking towards it, may even now be advantageously undertaken, we do think. A large Committee on the subject, of very various schools of thought, and from widely distant parts of the country and unlike states of society, at their first coming together possessing, for the most part, none but crude and vague notions of the work entrusted to them, arrived at their conclusion with a singular unanimity ; and it was adopted in the House by the votes of a large majority. It was supposed to have been passed by the Convention, and was reported and accounted Law, till it was finally discovered to have been lost in the House of Bishops under the influence of, what we mean no disrespect in calling, an unreasoning dread of innovation.

We regret the result, because we cannot see what harm the measure could do, and we think it might have been of some present and of more future utility. Some opposed it, because it did not go far enough ; was not the full-blown realization of their theoretic ideas. Others were against it, because they regarded it as the entering wedge through which a series of changes would come in, at the end of whose lengthened vista the affrighted eye caught a glimpse of a man in a tiara that might be called a Pope. But it was simply an arrangement by which the Dioceses in any State, be they more or less numerous, might associate together for certain local purposes, retaining their common interest in Missionary work, Educa-

tional establishments, Charity funds, and associating, as they did before a division, in their care and management. It seems to us, that as our Dioceses multiply, as they must, by the formation of new Sees out of existing Bishopricks, some such plan will be expedient and useful; and we see no very good reason why it was not adopted now. We think the sober reflection of three years will secure a more favorable issue.

On this subject of the division of Dioceses we hold a midway position. We certainly do not believe in the mincing process. We can see serious evils as its results, which we have not now space to discuss. And we do believe that great unwieldy districts, over which no Bishop with merely human powers can possibly exercise any efficient supervision, ought to be divided. No precedent drawn from Northern Africa, in the days of Cyprian or Augustine, would weigh much with us in favor of the one; nor such huge Sees as London, Lincoln, and Exeter, in England, convince us of the advantage of the other. The process of division is doubtless to go on. May a higher wisdom preside over it than man's. One pleasant result of this process we have in the new Diocese of Pittsburgh, which it was the privilege of the late General Convention to welcome into its fellowship. We congratulate it on its existence, and we congratulate it on its name,—so much better than the cumbersome nomenclature of which the only precedent had set the pattern. We hope the new precedent will fix the rule of our Diocesan terminology.

The subject of Education, not widely disconnected from that which has been under our consideration, received proper attention. The appointment of a Committee on Education, among the Standing Committees of Convention, has proved a measure of utility. The very able and elaborate Report on this subject made to the late Convention, its sensible and thorough discussion of the Family, the School, and the College, as the three great training institutions in which men are to be fitted for the work of this life in subordination to the supreme pursuit of another, and its clear statement of the necessity of having them all leavened with the principles of religious truth and duty, and kept in their proper living connection with the Church of God,

give it great value. It has been widely dispersed, and as widely praised. Would that it might obtain that best form of praise, the heedful regard and faithful following out of its wise suggestions. Nothing, besides the preaching of the Gospel and its Sacraments, can lie nearer to the Church's life.

There is one other topic coming within the purview of this Article,—the Hymnody of the Church. Few things within the range of the Church's authority are of equally difficult adjustment. The tastes of men are so various, their constitution, their culture, associations, habits of thought and feeling, that in a matter into which æsthetic considerations enter so largely, it is vain to look for much harmony of judgment. Take a number of cultivated and religious men and set them about the task, and it is pretty certain that no two of them will make the same selection. Any selection that is their joint work must be the fruit of compromise. The only wise and practicable course is to make those comparatively few Hymns which the Christian consciousness of the Church has unanimously approved, the foundation of the Collection; and then leave a pretty wide margin for the accommodation of different classes of worshippers, keeping within the bounds of sound doctrine, healthful sentiment, due reverence and propriety. To throw the whole subject open to individual discretion would be most unwise and dangerous. And to maintain that the Church has done so, after all the pains she has taken to provide for this important portion of God's Worship, may be made plausible by ingenious sophistry, but can be sustained by no solid and convincing arguments. To say, because our present Psalms and Hymns are simply *allowed*, that therefore everything else is allowed, and that these results of the Church's care stand on no higher authority than Watt's Psalms or the Methodist Hymn Book, will satisfy few minds of churchly culture and habits. When nothing is permissible without express allowance, and this is the true ground here, permission in a given instance renders the prohibition of all outside of it the more stringent and emphatic. And is it credible, or in the least according to analogy, or fitness, to suppose that the Church, after having provided for her members Prayers in prose, and strictly

prohibited the use of any others, should leave them to pray in rhyme any manner of nonsense, falsehood, or mawkish sensibility that presents itself to them in the guise of devotional verse? She is quite too wise and careful a mother to have done it, or ever to do it. The Church of England is not fairly quoted as a precedent here. For her present practice is simply connivance at an irregularity in a Church so tied and bound that she has no power to provide for her wants, or get rid of her troubles, but can only stand knocking at the door of a Government that is resolutely deaf.

The result of the Church's action on this subject at the late General Convention has been the issuing, under the direction of the Bishops, of fifty additional Hymns to be used at discretion in our Churches, and remain upon probation, as it were, till the next General Convention, for its final verdict. They are printed and before the Church. They are, perhaps, as satisfactory as anything is likely to be. Among them are a considerable number of Hymns which the whole Church will feel to be a great acquisition, belonging to that highest class, which, once introduced, will remain a part of the permanent nucleus of the Church's Hymnody. Others are of less value; but none can be condemned as unsound in sentiment, or greatly faulty in taste. We commend them to the Church as a real and valuable addition to her resources of Praise.

We now take leave of the late General Convention. We believe it will always be remarkable, and, in some respects, will increase in honor, as time rolls on. The Good Lord pardon its errors, and prosper its work, to the advancement of His glory, the good of His Church, and the safety, honor, and welfare of His people.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of restoring Visible Unity. AN EIRENICON, in a Letter to the Author of "The Christian Year." By E. B. PUSEY, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Fifth thousand. London: 1865. Parkers & Rivingtons. 8vo., pp. 409. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

Aside from the high position which Dr. Pusey fills in the English Church, as a man of profound learning, of earnest piety, and as the acknowledged representative of a large and increasing number of Churchmen, several things have contributed to fasten upon this his latest work no small share of attention, and it has been the occasion of no little excitement, which, as we write, has not yet subsided. The "Eirenicon," in a Letter to Dr. Keble, was called forth as a reply to "Archbishop" Manning's Letter to Dr. Pusey. In this Letter, Dr. Manning had repeated several of the stereotyped charges against the English Church; for (1) "its denials of truths which, he says, it has rejected;" (2) for "detaching the truths which it has received from the divine voice of the Church;" and (3) for "denying the perpetual and ever-present assistance of the Holy Spirit, whereby the Church, in every age, is not only preserved from error, but enabled to declare the truth." These general charges against the English Church, Dr. Manning particularizes and applies, with the shrewdness of a man who knows every fibre and throbbing of the English heart, and with that power of language of which he is an acknowledged master.

To this attack, Dr. Pusey was advised to reply, and the result is the volume before us. It is of course impossible for us, here and now, to give any account of the manner in which Dr. Pusey has done his work. But he has placed himself, in dealing with such an antagonist, on what may be called the Catholic side of his subject, and has sought to vindicate the Catholicity of the English Church in her Faith, Sacraments, and Articles. Without criticising his method in this line of argument, or estimating the measure of his success, we observe, that he then proceeds to carry the war into the enemy's camp. And here we do not hesitate to say, that a more complete exposition of the fallacy of several of the dogmas of modern Romanism, has not been made in the present century; and the work is done all the more effectively, from the author's kindness of manner, and his entire avoidance of the popular clap-trap of unguarded denunciation. Take, for example, Dr. Pusey's test and definition of the Rule of Faith, as held by the English Church on the one hand, and by Rome on the other. Nothing can be clearer or better. Take his showing of the Romish doctrine of Infallibility; and of the *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin. Take his exhibition and proof of the influence of the Forged Decretals on Romish Discipline. If Rome has had heavier blows aimed at her in late years, we do not know by whom. If Dr. Manning is a man of

sense, he will rue the day when he provoked such a disclosure of the weakness of the Romish argument.

In some of the strictures called forth by this volume, it has been maintained that Dr. Pusey is untrue, even to the extent of disloyalty to the English Church; and that his apostacy to Rome may most certainly be anticipated. We confess that we believe he is in much less danger of going to Rome than many of those who use such language. Here, for example, and it is only one instance, is what he says of the Church of England. "It is very observable how the presence of the English Church keeps this belief [of the Blessed Virgin] from taking the forms which it does where it is unchecked. This may be one of her offices, in God's hands. She preserves the entire Faith, such as our Lord left it with the Apostles, to evangelize the world. She believes all which the undivided Church believed, as of Faith," &c. p. 259.

In saying all this, however, we add, that we greatly doubt the wisdom and propriety of several of the positions which Dr. Pusey has taken, both defensive and offensive. With our appreciation of the Church of England on the one hand, and the Church of Rome on the other, as brought to the test of a true, genuine Catholicity, we say distinctly, that he has not, on certain points, met his shrewd, wily, casuistical opponent, with the most effective weapons. For example, in one of his defensive and explanatory Letters in the public prints, published since the volume was issued, he avows a readiness, in the event of a restored Unity, to "recognize the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome." Yet, Dr. Pusey must know, that on Catholic principles, there are several other Bishops, whose claims to such Primacy are higher than that of the Bishop of Rome; and not a few, whose claims are at least equal to his; and that of these, the Archbishop of Canterbury is one.

Again, he says, "I have long been convinced that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were explained authoritatively, *i. e.*, by the Roman Church itself, not by individual theologians only. This involves the conviction on my side, that there is nothing in our Articles which cannot be explained rightly, as not contradicting any things held to be *de fide* in the Roman Church. The great body of the faith is held alike by both."

This paragraph surprises us. Dr. Pusey knows, that the errors of the Council of Trent, in its Creeds, its Canons and Decrees, are regarded by the Church of Rome herself, as being *de fide*. Besides, there is another point of vital importance. Previous to that Council, Romish Corruptions, gross as they were, were held in a state of solution. At and by that Council, they were crystallized into form, embodied into dogmatic statement, and received the *imprimatur*, formal and authoritative, of that Church. Thenceforth, the hindrance to Union with Rome became normal, constitutional,—one entering into the very foundation of her System; and so, admitting no possibility of explanation. Had Dr. Pusey chosen to say, that that Council was, in no sense, an Œcumenical one, and so, in no way, entitled to the regard

of an English Churchman, he would have intimated a way in which a Union of the Western Churches is among the possibilities of the future; or, had he, like Archbishop Wake, discussed the question of Union with that class of Roman Catholics represented by the moderate Gallicans,—and they were once numerous and powerful,—he would have appealed to the sympathies of all true Catholic Churchmen. But, in respect to Rome as she now is, there are some things of more pressing importance even than Union; for they are conditions on which, and on which alone, Union is either possible or desirable.

Neither does the attitude which Dr. Pusey assumes toward Rome seem to us a particularly commanding one,—explaining away, or showing how may be explained away, certain Modern Romish Novelties and corruptions, as no insuperable barrier to Union and Unity. And all this, too, is at a time when Rome is growing every year more insolent, more intolerant, more infatuated; and, in all that gives character to the System, more offensive to all true Catholic feeling. Such apparent uneasiness at separation from Rome, surely, is not the best way, on the part of an integral branch of the Catholic Church, to command respect, to challenge attention to its own claims, or to lead the Church of Rome to cast aside her uncatholic abuses and errors.

Very different from this is the tone of this same Dr. Manning, on the occasion of his late enthroning at Moorsfields. After such an exhibition of the spirit and designs of that Schismatical Sect, in the very heart of England, we can hardly be surprised at the almost impatience which some of the noblest men in England are manifesting at the appearance of the Eirenicon. Dr. Manning says:—

“England is not further from the faith and unity of the Church now, than when St. Gregory sent the pallium to St. Augustine. And St. Augustine could little foresee the glories of the Saxon Church, or the perilous and majestic greatness of the Norman. What may be our future, God only knows, but we are bound in faith to hope great things, and in fidelity to endeavor them. We should fail in our duty to our Divine Master, if we were to aim at anything less than the conversion of England, the redemption of all our brethren from heresy and from Schisms, the reconciliation of our country, dear to me next after the Church of God, to the Kingdom of Jesus Christ. It is a paltry service and an earthly prudence which aims at anything less than the whole breadth of our divine commission. Two things are certain,—the one, that Protestantism, after running, like other heresies, its course of 300 years, is dissolving and vanishing away; the other, that the Catholic faith is irresistibly expanding on every side. These two operations never rest. Everything that wears the semblance of a theology or of a Church out of the unity of the only true fold, is visibly changing and passing out of sight. In a generation or two, the Anglican religion will be like Donatism or Arianism, a page in history. The immutable and imperishable Church, in the midst of a world-wide conflict, which is rising higher and higher every day, will be all the more visible to the nations of the sole ark of salvation, moving upon the face of the waters. For this we will labor on, in



perfect confidence that God will accomplish His own work when and as He wills."

Far more worthy of a defender of an integral branch of the Catholic Church as it seems to us, and better suited to the occasion, are the words of Canon Wordsworth:—"If we of the Church and Clergy of England, seek to make compromises and accommodations with the Papacy, we shall alienate and repel from us those holy, pious, and learned men in Italy and France who best know its corruptions, errors, and usurpations, and its infatuated adhesion to them, and who are weary of them, and groan under them, and who now eagerly yearn for union with us on the solid basis of Holy Scripture, interpreted by the voice and practice of the Catholic Church in primitive times."

**THE DIVINE LIFE AND THE NEW BIRTH.** By the Rev. JAMES CRAIK, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Louisville, Ky. Author of "Search of Truth," &c. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1866. 12mo., pp. 359.

The key note to this book, the distinct idea which Dr. Craik has here so elaborately wrought out, was brought before the Church by him in a former volume, "The Search of Truth." Further reading and reflection, the general discussion of the subject, and the constant developments of various forms of Error in our country,—we suppose these were the influences,—have led the author to recast the volume, and to produce what is almost an entirely new work. In our comments upon Dr. Craik's previous volume, we dissented from some of his phraseology. It is merely a matter of definition of terms. In his present treatise, he recognizes the existence of some of these technical difficulties, and we assure him that he has not over-estimated them. The whole question turns upon the use of the term *Life*, and its employment in a System of positive Church teaching. Given Dr. Craik's definition, we have not one word of dissent.

The great principle, however, which he announces and illustrates with so much ability and clearness, is not only undeniably true, but it is of the greatest possible importance. That principle is, the Universality of Redemption, and its benefits, in a certain sense, coëval with, and co-equal to, the necessities of Man. The popular theology teaches, or implies, that up to the Advent of Christ, Man was under a mere System of Law; and that the Gospel was only designed for a certain elect few. Dr. Craik, in the great truth which he enunciates, gives the death-blow, not only to Pelagianism, but to that narrow System of John Calvin, and to the Rationalism, and Infidelity, which, with the fidelity of a shadow, have followed in its train, on the Continent, and in Great Britain, and in our own country. Reason, instinct, consciousness, and observation are all in revolt against its dogmas. In relieving the Plan of Salvation by Christ of the difficulties which thoughtful and honest-minded, but badly educated men have always felt upon the subject, Dr. Craik has achieved a work of great value. His arguments are always from God's Word and from the very nature of the Atonement, as therein revealed. One of the most

valuable of the Chapters now added, (Chap. VIII.) gives the testimony of the Primitive Church to this view of the Gospel, and some of the most distinguished of modern divines. In developing his main truth, he also traces it clearly in its relations to the Doctrines and Institutions of the Church; and shows its bearings upon some of the mischievous errors of our times. Four new Chapters, on the Creed; on Divine Revelation—an Appeal to Human Reason; on Church and State; and on Christian Unity, conclude this timely volume.

The Clergy will find the work an excellent one for their Parish and Sunday-School Libraries, and the very thing that they need to place in the hands of a certain class of their parishioners. In this way it should be extensively used.

**ESSAYS ON THE SUPERNATURAL ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY**, with special reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tübingen School. By the Rev. GEORGE P. FISHER, M. A., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Company, 124 Grand street. 1866. 8vo., pp. 586.

In our last No. of the Review, in our notice of Dr. Bushnell's work on Sacrifice, we gave an illustration of the extent to which a bald, brazen-faced Infidelity is taught in New England, in the name and under the cover of Orthodoxy. It was with some interest, therefore, that we opened the volume before us, on such a subject, from the Professor of Church History in Yale College. It gives us sincere pleasure to find, that Prof. Fisher has not only no sympathy with the irreverent spirit, the brain-spun speculations of such men as Dr. Bushnell; but, that he has set himself to work, to expose the inconsistencies, the contradictions, the absurdities, of the leaders of what is called the School of Modern Criticism. Prof. Fisher is evidently well read in modern German Theological Literature; and, as with the late Dr. Murdock, he has lost all respect, certainly all reverence, for it. He does not hesitate to say, that "Positivism is Atheism;" and that Theodore Parker, "in his practical use of the documents, is not less arbitrary than his Tübingen compeers. He believes, where it suits him to believe; and elsewhere, the authority of the Evangelist goes for nothing." In that single sentence, Prof. Fisher has described the whole System of modern German Infidelity.

The author does not take up at all the subject of Inspiration, which is of course the great question, nor the alleged discrepancies in the Gospel Narratives. His object is to prove the genuineness and credibility of the Books of the New Testament. Perhaps the ablest of these Essays, certainly the most thoroughly considered, are those on "The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel," and on "Recent discussions upon the origin of the first three Gospels." St. John's Gospel, especially, so full of the God-man, has always been the object of the intense spite of these petty quibblers. In these two Essays of Prof. Fisher, the silly sophistries and the groundless assumptions of Strauss and Baur are thoroughly exposed, and are treated with quite as much serious attention as they deserve. It is not argument, which can ever

reach them; for argument has very little to do with their present position. And yet, it may be well enough, now and then, to shut their mouths. It should be noticed, however, that when the Professor seeks to prove the genuineness of St. John's Gospel, and he does prove it, he is compelled to adopt, and does adopt, a method of reasoning which, we beg to suggest to him, proves a good many other things than that for which he makes use of it.

His "Essay on the origin of Catholic Christianity," as he calls it, is, to us, one of the most illogical and unsatisfactory portions of his work. While he upsets the foundation of the theory of the Tübingen School, he really substitutes nothing in its place; nor can he, and be consistent with himself, while he remains in his present position. We have no room to illustrate at length what we mean. But, speaking of the latter half of the second century, he says; "the Church is comparatively pure in doctrine, and free in government; yet the incipient and germinant Papal system is clearly discernible." Now, we beg to assure the learned Professor, that if he will examine the Early Church Fathers, as fearlessly of consequences to himself, and as impartially, as he has the writings of Strauss and Baur, he will find a solution of "one of the most interesting problems of history," without resorting to German nonsense; and he will not find there a single particle of the "Papal System," either.

The work cannot but exert a conservative influence upon the younger Congregational ministers of New England.

**PERSONAL REMINISCENCES of the Life and Times of GARDINER SPRING, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the City of New York.** New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. Two Vols., 12mo., pp. 348, 293.

Dr. Spring has long been known as a leading Presbyterian divine, and as Pastor of the largest and wealthiest congregation of that denomination in New York City. At the age of eighty years he writes his Auto-biography. In all cases, even the garrulity of old age does not deserve severe criticism, and the infirmities of second childhood are always to be treated tenderly. There are certain points in this work which strongly provoke plain comment; but these, for the present, we pass by. Dr. Spring was born at Newburyport, Mass., Feb. 24, 1785; was Classmate at Yale College with John C. Calhoun; graduated in 1805, at the age of twenty, with the highest honors of his Class; taught School and studied Law; became religious, and entered the Congregational Ministry; and in May, 1810, became Pastor of the "Brick Church" in New York City, which position he still fills. In several respects, these volumes are both interesting and valuable. They show how it is, that a man, even in New York City, with all its distractions, can still accomplish a vast amount of labor,—for he has been a voluminous author,—besides meeting the constant demands of his own people. They give a glimpse, and it is only that, of the convulsions which have rent Presbyterianism in twain; and which can never be healed, without stultifying one or the other of the

parties. They recall the old doctrinal warfare of Calvinism; and bring once more upon the stage, Edwards, and Emmons, and Hopkins, and Dwight, and Taylor, and Nettleton, and Woods, and Stuart, and Beecher, and Barnes. In all this contest, Dr. Spring seems to have been a sort of "Vicar of Bray;" though his active sympathies were evidently with the more rigid of modern Calvinists. Still, his volumes show, most clearly, that he did not concern himself with the deeper and more vital doctrinal questions which were involved; and hence the charges of inconsistency which were brought against him by one or other of the parties. He was rather a rhetorician than a logician and metaphysician, and his tastes and talents evidently lay in the direction of the practical application of Theology to the heart and life. Here he has made himself felt upon the age and times. His published works are nearly all of this popular character. The volumes also have notices of several important Societies,—the American Bible Society, the American Board of Foreign Missions, and the American Home Missionary Society; with the origin of each of which he was personally familiar. The volumes also contain a considerable amount of gossip, personal, family, and social; of no general interest, but which his special friends and admirers may, perhaps, be glad to see. There is an item of history recalled by Dr. Spring which is worth preserving. It is worth pondering, for many reasons. It was in 1812, when New England was threatening forcible resistance to the Federal Government, and pleading the doctrine of "State Sovereignty," &c., &c., in the face of War with England, that President Madison, in Sept., 1812, wrote to the father of Dr. Spring, as follows:—"I will not conceal the surprise, the pain I feel, at declarations from any portion of the American people, that measures resulting from the national will, constitutionally pronounced, and carrying with them the most solemn sanctions, are not to be pursued into effect without the hazard of civil war. This is surely not the legitimate course. Neither is it the language, on other occasions, heard from the same quarter, nor a course consistent with the duration or efficacy of any government."

**NARRATIVE OF AN EXPEDITION to the Zambesi and its Tributaries; and of the discovery of the Lakes Shirwa and Nyassa. 1858—1864. By DAVID and CHARLES LIVINGSTONE. With Maps and Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 8vo. pp. 638.**

Dr. Livingstone has passed the greater part of his time in Africa for the last twenty-six years. A Scotchman by birth, and a member of the Scotch Kirk, he was sent out by the London Missionary Society, in 1840, to explore the interior of Southern and Central Africa. In 1858 he published his "Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa; including a Sketch of Sixteen Years' Residence in the Interior of Africa, and a Journey from the Cape of Good Hope to Loanda on the West Coast; thence across the Continent, down the River Zambesi, to the Eastern Ocean." The interest awakened by his discoveries led to the Mission of the Universities, so noble in its

conception, and so noble in everything, alas! but its results. The death of Bishop Mackenzie, whose grave, on the banks of the Shire, Dr. Livingstone visited, and the abandonment of the field by his successor, Bishop Tozer, have apparently sealed the fate of that undertaking. The causes of the failure of that Mission are obvious from what Dr. Livingstone has told us. It was commenced with the purest motives, and the most heroic zeal and fortitude, but in utter misunderstanding of the work and its methods. So important seemed the commercial capacities and prospects of Southern Central Africa,—a region lying between  $10^{\circ}$  and  $19^{\circ}$  south latitude, and  $25^{\circ}$  and  $41^{\circ}$  longitude West,—that in the year 1858, under the auspices of the British Government and the Royal Geographical Society, Dr. Livingstone again started for that rich, populous, but almost unknown region; and the results of these six years of explorations are given in this large volume which the Messrs. Harper have issued with their accustomed liberality. The great River Zambesi, and its Victoria Falls, almost rivalling in grandeur, Niagara; the great Lake Nyassa, 210 miles long and 26 miles wide, the source of the River Shire, the northern branch of the Zambesi; the teeming population on its shores; the rich products of that tropical region, cotton, coffee, indigo, &c.; the blighting influence of Portuguese usurpation, and their barbarizing policy along 1360 miles of the Eastern coast; the entire failure of Jesuit Missions, the ruins of which Dr. Livingstone found in his travels—all these are described in the volume. He also gives much information respecting the country, its people, productions, capabilities, &c. The sneers of Capt. Burton, at the results of Christian Missions in Africa, and his theory that Mahometanism is to be looked to as the civilizer of that country, Dr. Livingstone disposes of as effectually as he demolished the cavils of Dr. Colenso a little while ago. He proves, by facts, that on the Western coast of Africa, Christian Missions and Christian Civilization have already wrought wonders.

He proposes now to undertake a new tour of exploration; and, by ascending the Rovuma, or some other river north of Cape Delgado, to examine the country north of Lake Nyassa, and to ascertain the watershed of that portion of Central Africa. He does not expect to upset the theory of Speke and Grant, whose claims to the discovery of the sources of the Nile he acknowledges.

THE BOOK OF HOURS, in which are contained Offices for the Seven Canonical Hours, Litanies, and other Devotions. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 12mo. pp. 171.

This little volume has been the occasion of so much harsh, and we must say, exceedingly unkind and unjust criticism, that we speak of it the more confidently. In the application of Christianity to private and social wants, regard must be had to the exigences and actual condition of society. We speak of Christianity now as a Life and as a Worship. Communities of Christians, Brotherhoods and Sisterhoods, may be adapted to some times and some places, and not adapted to

other times and other places. There may be circumstances where they are a necessity in bringing our blessed Religion to bear upon society, its poverty, its degradation, its depravity, its suffering. Such associated power, a principle acknowledged in all other departments of social life, has been employed among Protestants on the Continent of Europe, in England, and in our own country. To such associations of persons whose lives are wholly devoted to Christ, to serve Him in specific works of charity, Forms of Devotion, suited to their peculiar needs, are indispensable. Such a volume, the compiler of the work before us has sought to prepare. He has drawn from Anglican, Gallican, and Oriental Offices, which are familiar to our best liturgists. And no one who appreciates the heavenly beauty, the rich, almost inspired language of some of the Collects in our Prayer Book, will need to be assured that there are other treasures for the heart in the same sources whence they were derived, and of which they form but a small part. This Liturgical Service of Offices and Litanies, &c., is carefully selected and arranged for the Seven Hours of Prayer, during each of the seasons, Advent, Christmas Tide, Lent, Easter Tide, and Trinity; and is full of the Atoning Sacrifice of the Cross, and of the language of penitence, and faith, and devotion.

There is another line of thought suggested by this Book of Hours. How can our Holy Religion be made to reach the thousands on thousands of the poorer classes of our large cities, who are fast lapsing into the darkest heathenism? They must be gained for Christ in some way. They are living in cellars, and in garrets, and in tenement houses; where retirement and private devotion at home are impossible. To such persons a Church always open, and a Daily Service, and a Religion, which brings not only salvation from sin, but a rule of daily life, meet their necessities. For example, there are forty thousand such people in the lower Wards of this city, which the various Sects, in removing up-town, have utterly abandoned. Now, a Choral Service may be uncalled for in an ordinary Parish Church; it may be unedifying to a stranger, or to one not accustomed to it. But to the crowds of these poorer classes who flock to old Trinity on a Sunday, that Service is a reality; as their hearty responses, and their devout attention to the preacher show. If they can be thus won to Christ, who will forbid!

In the "Book of Hours," admirably guarded as it is in the main, from Medieval errors, there is one Hymn to which we must take exception. It is on the "Holy Eucharist." In it are the following lines:

"Therefore we before it bending,  
This great Sacrament adore."

Inconsistent as other portions of this Hymn are with the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, and more clearly defined as the true doctrine is, in the other two Hymns on the same subject, these lines, or the whole Hymn, we hope, will be omitted in another edition. The lines in the original Latin Hymn, "*Pange lingua*," in the *Roman Breviary*, are as follows:



Tantum ergo Sacramentum,  
Veneremur cernui.

If it be claimed, as it is, that the word *veneremur*, in the original, does not always signify worship in the true sense of that term, but may be used to express only a high degree of reverence, yet no such plea can be put in for the word used in the translation before us. The word *adore* has, in the public mind, but one signification. These lines just cited teach the worshipper to "ADORE" "IT," the Sacrament. There are two parts in a Sacrament. The outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper, is "Bread and Wine; which the Lord hath commanded to be received." The inward part, or thing signified, is "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Now, to adore unqualifiedly the Sacrament, is, of course, to adore the necessary parts of which the Sacrament consists. To adore Bread and Wine is idolatry. If these cease to be, and are no longer Bread and Wine, but are, literally and substantially, the Body and Blood of Christ, then it is no longer a Sacrament, but is verily that of which it purports to be a Sacrament. If it is said, in explanation, that we are not to adore the Sacrament, but to adore Christ, Who is present in, or under, or by, or through, or with the Sacrament; that is giving up the whole thing; and it is far better to give up the language also. For it is only popularizing a Romish definition, which is certainly a corruption of the Faith, and which has ever been a great plague in the Church. This Romish perversion is contradicted by Holy Scripture; it has no place in the Earliest Fathers, nor in the most Primitive Liturgies. It is a Romish definition; and definitions have been, and are, the curse of modern Christendom.

Nor is this all; if the Sacrament becomes, literally and substantially, the very Body and Blood of Christ, and if this same Body is really and truly offered by the Priest as a Sacrifice on the Altar, then, as a matter of course, the Expiatory nature and merits of that Sacrifice belong to it; and thus we have full-blown Romanism in one of its worst forms.

In order to inspire reverence for the Sacrament, surely it is not necessary to employ language so exceptionable as this, and so certain to give offence needlessly. Nor need we, in appropriating the pure gold, which we find in the age to which this Hymn belongs, take possession of the dross also.

THE HISTORY of the Church in Connecticut, from the settlement of the Colony to the death of Bishop Seabury. By the Rev. E. EDWARDS BEARDSLEY, D. D., Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New Haven. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1865. 8vo., pp. 470.

A full review of this important work appears in our previous pages, and by a writer, than whom there is no one better qualified to estimate the principles by which the early Churchmen of Connecticut were influenced, and the martyr-like devotion and steadfastness with



which they maintained them. There was no *Namby-pambyism* in them. They were clear-headed, and true-hearted. They knew their work, and they were not afraid to do it.

**WAR OF THE REBELLION; Or, Scylla and Charybdis.** Consisting of Observations upon the Causes, Course, and Consequences of the late Civil War in the United States. By H. S. FOOTE. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 12mo. pp. 440.

In several respects, this is a very remarkable book. The authors' own antecedents are somewhat peculiar, as our readers will doubtless remember; formerly Governor of Mississippi, and Senator from that State in the U. S. Congress; afterwards in public life in California; and then, Senator in the Confederate Congress from Tennessee. The volume is still more remarkable for the boldness with which he treats of public men and measures, and for the disclosures which he makes concerning them. Apparently scorning, at least, regardless of what the world calls prudence, and judgment, and discretion, and unmindful sometimes, as it seems to us, of consistency and delicacy, he seems to have set himself down, deliberately, to tear away the veil which hides from public view the secret motives and hidden machinations of leading men during the late Civil War, and long before it. Having glanced briefly at the question of Slavery in the early settlement of the country, and at the organization of our Government, he comes down to this disturbing element in our own day. He certainly draws his portraits fearlessly; and his sketches of Calhoun, and Webster, and Clay, and Douglass, and Fillmore, and Pierce, and Buchanan, and Davis, and Slidell, and Benjamin, and Hindman, and Northrop, and Seddon, and Stephens, and Seward, and the parts which they have played in this great tragedy, will command attention and, doubtless, provoke criticism.

**THE CRITERION; or the Test of Talk about Familiar Things.** A Series of Essays. By HENRY T. TUCKERMAN. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 12mo., pp. 377.

When the "Popular Lecture" was an "Institution" among us, Mr. Tuckerman's name was enough to draw a crowd; and now that his contributions are thrown into another form, he deserves to rank as one of the best, we think him the very best, of American Essayists. No American author so constantly reminds us, as Mr. Tuckerman, of Addison and Steele, who, a century and a half ago, made the *Tatler*, and the *Spectator*, a power in society. We are not comparing, or contrasting, his Essays with theirs. But we might easily find the secret of the abiding reputation of those English Essayists, without estimating, at all, the intellectual strength, the ripe, rich culture, the genuine warmth, the artistic skill, of those writers, in connection with our American author. They did not write merely to amuse. We cannot define here the qualifications requisite for high excellence in this department of Letters; but in playful humor, Mr. Tuckerman is most

deficient. A solemn, straight-laced dignity, is all very well in its place; but we do not want it always. In his Essay on Preachers, there is a tone which reminds one of the prince of modern cynics, Carlyle; and a quasi philosophical dogmatism which, with Buckle, ignores one of the divine conditions of Society. We find this same element less apparent, in the Essay on "Sepulchres." A positive Faith here would have changed an ice-berg into a flower-garden. But these are exceptional cases. The other Essays, are on Inns, Authors, Pictures, Doctors, Holidays, Lawyers, Actors, Newspapers, Statues, Bridges.

**MASSACHUSETTS ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.** By EDWARD BUCK, of the Suffolk Bar. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1866. 12mo., pp. 310.

We have heard of a great many misnomers, such as white-black-birds, &c., but we never before met with anything quite so original, as a learned treatise, by a learned lawyer, on Massachusetts Ecclesiastical Law. The old Puritans, when they settled in Massachusetts, brought with them very decided opinions on a good many matters. They knew, to an absolute certainty, that they were "the saints," and that to "the saints" belongs the earth. The limits of Parishes were fixed geographical divisions. From 1638, onward, for a considerable period, every inhabitant was compelled, by the General Court, to pay for the support of Puritanism, and not only this, but to attend upon its worship. Not until 1835, was the Law repealed, which imposed a fine upon the absentee. Only "Church-members" in good standing could hold office, or vote for Civil Officers. Baptists were banished. Quakers were lashed upon their bare backs, their tongues were bored through with a hot iron, and, as a last resort, were hung. Papists, upon a second conviction, "were to be put to death." At an early period in the history of the Colony, such gross inconsistency with their own professions when they asked and obtained their Charters, began to be met with a storm of remonstrance, and at last one concession after another was extorted from these "freedom-of-conscience" men, in behalf of various religious bodies. The volume before us is largely made up of *cases* of litigation constantly occurring under these Ecclesiastical Laws of Massachusetts; as also of the ruling of Courts, and usage in respect to Marriage, the Lord's Day, Public Charities, Burial Grounds, Pew holding, &c., &c. We have also, in this volume, a clear statement of the legal grounds on which these old Puritan Parishes, having become Unitarian in doctrine, were able to retain possession of the buildings, Funds, Records, &c., &c., even though the "Orthodox" seceders were largely in the majority. This contest, which convulsed the whole Commonwealth, and engaged the ablest talent of the State, began in 1818.

As we said in the outset, the volume is *sui generis*. The great principles of Ecclesiastical Law, we thought, were long ago settled; but we had not then seen this volume on the Ecclesiastical Law of Massachusetts. It is a curious book, and we hope to return to it on another occasion. The learned author, in closing his Preface, men-

tions the "reasonable hopes entertained by many Christian men, that Congregational churches are to be the churches of the future." As things now seem, there is very little prospect of their being "the Churches" of Massachusetts, at least; and the record of his pages does not open up a very delightful picture, if indeed they are to be "the churches" anywhere.

THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN, Physically, Morally and Spiritually considered; Or, The Christian Philosopher. By B. F. HATCH, M. D. New York: Published by the author. 1866. 8vo., pp. 654.

We decline noticing this huge book with any particularity, for several reasons. In the first place, the principles upon which the author's theory is based, are so abhorrent to even the instincts of all sound Churchmen, that there is no possible need of adverting to them. In the next place, its course of reasoning, so far as it has even the show of argument, takes for granted the very things to be proved, and does not, therefore, need refutation. In this respect, the work is as unphilosophical as it well can be. And finally, we could not expose the true character of the book, without dipping our pen into a puddle of obscenity, with which, most assuredly, we shall not soil our pages. The author was formerly a Spiritualist, and is, or was, the husband of a certain Cora L. V. Hatch, a famous public "trance-medium." His "Christian Philosophy," as he profanely terms it, is an incoherent, unscholarly, illogical defense of a sort of Animal Magnetism. Whether it is better or worse than Spiritualism, we do not know. All these delusions are the natural fruit of Modern Schism, and yet the believers in them are said to be increasing in numbers, in this country and in England. When the author tells us that he has at last found the antidote to Infidelity, he simply means, as we understand him, that men must, of necessity, believe in spiritual existences of some sort, a truth which they formerly tried in vain to deny.

The two main features of the work before us are, its gross materialism, or a sort of semi-Pantheism, and its disgusting sexualism. This latter characteristic of the system, as seen in its practical working, is so often and so offensively obtruded upon the public in the newspapers of the day, that no further allusion to it is necessary. It is quite suggestive, as bearing upon the popularity of the delusion.

This one reflection forces itself upon our attention. We see the amazing folly, and the terrible danger, of cutting one's-self adrift from the old moorings of Christ and His Church, "the pillar and ground of the Truth," and venturing out, without compass, or helm, or anchor, upon the sea of human speculation, where the learned and the unlearned are equally at fault.

SPIRITUALISM IDENTICAL WITH ANCIENT SORCERY, NEW TESTAMENT DEMONOLOGY, AND MODERN WITCHCRAFT. With the Testimony of God and Man against it. By WM. M'DONALD. New York: Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry street. 1866. 16mo., pp. 212.

The author was requested by the "Providence District Ministers' Association," to prepare an essay on the "History of Spiritualism," and the present volume is the result. He has sought to be faithful and thorough in his work, though he must have wallowed through a deal of filth and abomination, in the pursuit of his object. He regards Spiritualism, and the Demonology of Scripture, and the Sorcery of the Greeks and Romans, and the Witchcraft of New England, as all the same identical thing, and as alike the works of the Devil. For ourselves, we have always supposed that the nastiness of the system was, of itself, a sufficient reason for giving the whole thing a wide berth, without asking whether the Devil was the instigator of it. The author gives the following anathema, which one of the Lecturers publicly pronounced. "Cursed be the marriage institution; cursed be the relation of husband and wife; cursed be all who would sustain legal marriage! What if there are a few tears shed, or a few hearts broken? They only go to build up a great principle; and all great truths have their martyrs." And there is plenty more of stuff even worse than this.

**SOCIAL LIFE OF THE CHINESE.** With some account of their Religious, Governmental, Educational and Business Customs and Opinions. With special, but not exclusive reference to Fuhchau. By Rev. JUSTUS DOOLITTLE, Fourteen Years member of the American Board. With over one hundred and fifty illustrations. In two volumes, 12mo., cloth. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. pp. 459. 490.

The long experience of Mr. Doolittle in China, and the liberality of the Publishers, and their abundant facilities, have contributed to produce one of the best works on China that has appeared,—the very best on the "Social Life of the Chinese." Under this head, we have minute descriptions, profusely illustrated, of agricultural and domestic matters; betrothal and marriage; married life and children; superstitious treatment of disease; death, mourning, and burial; ancestral tablets and halls; Priests of the three Religions, Buddhism, Tauism, and Confucianism; Popular Gods and Goddesses; Mandarins and their subordinates; the State Religion; Literary Examinations; Annual Customs and Festivals; singular and popular Superstitions; business Customs; charitable practices; social customs; charms and omens; Fortune-telling; Opium and Opium-smoking; Chinese and Scripture customs; Missionary topics; interior view of Peking. This work confirms us in the opinion, that, in the popular apprehension, the Chinese, as a people, are greatly underestimated; and that the small success of the 187 Protestant Missionaries among these four hundred millions of heathens, is scarcely a matter of surprise. Only the very best minds should be sent on Missionary labor anywhere, and especially to deal with the shrewd intellects of the East.

**THE PILGRIM'S WALLET;** or, Scraps of Travel, gathered in England, France, and Germany. By GILBERT HAVEN. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 12mo., pp. 492.

There is pretension enough in this book to call for a few words of notice. The author we suppose to be a Methodist, perhaps a Congregational preacher. The points which he visited in England, France and Germany, are those around which, to the eye of the scholar and the Christian, cluster the liveliest and tenderest associations. But this Rev. Mr. Haven, while he attempts to sentimentalize, and does really get off, now and then, a "smart" thing, is yet flippant and superficial, and is a fair specimen of what may well be called an American cockney. He reminds one of a third-rate orchestra. There is wind and flourish enough, but the soul of harmony is wanting. He confesses that, on the score of preparation and indebtedness, he "would make grateful mention of guide-books, companions who lightened the task of travel with their fellowship, of but little French, and less German, and far from least, of my canes and boots." As a specimen of the spirit of the writer, while at Canterbury, and at the noble old Cathedral, so hallowed by those sacred memories of four hundred years immediately after Christ, of which he evidently knows nothing, he delivers himself as follows :—" Besides, the Archbishop must live in state at London ; and so many here pay tribute to the Cathedral. It is a bloated old spider, that sits in its dusty cobweb, eating modern flies, who feel themselves honored by gratifying its aristocratic palate and filling its ecclesiastical maw. Nothing is more ludicrously senile than the Cathedral Service of England." " A good American prayer-meeting, lively, social, devout, is the best modern expression of ancient Worship. But such a meeting, held in one of these Cathedrals, would break, in an instant, all the rotten strands that bind the Church and State together, and then what would become of our livings ? So, like modern fellahs, they use the mummies of their fathers to make the pot boil." Again, he says ; " After all, London fame settles on two men,—Punshon and Spurgeon." Now it would be a sufficient reply to all such stuff as this, if it were worthy of a reply, to quote the language of such a man as Henry Ward Beecher, in his glowing description of the wonderful power and almost heavenly beauty and glory, of the same Cathedral Service. But then Mr. Beecher is really a man of some culture. Indeed, the book throughout its record of the author's travels and observations, and in lands so fragrant of the past and studded with the monuments of Science, Art, and Religion, abounds in historical inaccuracies and in pert criticisms. We suspect that he was not infrequently snubbed for the impertinence which American travellers are so often charged with ; and so he " spreads " himself in the " American Eagle " style, to his heart's content. And yet, with all the repulsive features of the book, especially to an educated Churchman, and with which he cannot but be constantly disgusted,—it is sketchy, and is well worth looking over.

**A TEXT BOOK ON ANATOMY, PHYSIOLOGY, AND HYGIENE.** For the use of Schools and Families. By JOHN C. DRAPER, M. D., Professor of Natural History and Physiology in the New York Free Academy, and Professor of Analytical Chemistry in the University

of New York. With one hundred and seventy Illustrations. New York; Harper & Brothers. 1866. 8vo., pp. 300.

There is undoubtedly a tendency, just now, not only to introduce the study of Modern Science, and especially of Modern Languages, and of Physics, into our higher Institutions of learning, but to substitute these for the old *curriculum* of our best Colleges and of the European Universities. The popular cry is for a Practical Education. It is the wrong way to get the "golden egg;" and the tendency, when pushed to the extreme, is full of mischief. Still, there is an element of truth and of good sense at the bottom of this movement. This Text Book of Prof. Draper, contains a course of Lectures delivered before the Free Academy of New York, on Anatomy, Physiology, and Hygiene; and are as simple, and as popular, as such a subject can be made, when treated with anything like thoroughness. He thinks the doctrine of the Unity of the Race, "by far the most natural and probable;" a doctrine which such men as both the Humboldts, Max Muller, and Bunsen, and others scarcely less distinguished, have taught much more positively. We are sorry to see such an unqualified endorsement of Prof. J. W. Draper's theory of "the influence of physical agents on the course and duration of national life."

THE LETTERS OF WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART. (1769-1791.)

Translated from Collection of Ludwig Nohl. By LADY WALLACE. With a Portrait and Fac-simile. In two volumes, 12mo. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. pp. 332, 297.

Mozart was born at Salzburg, Upper Austria, in 1756; his father being a distinguished musician. At a very early age, the son, while travelling with the father, gave full proof, at Rome, and Naples, and Paris, and London, of his wonderful talent, both as a composer and performer. In 1780, he settled at Vienna, where he was admired and patronized by the Court and City; and in 1788, he was appointed Chapel-Master to the Emperor Joseph. He died at the early age of 36 years, Nov. 5, 1791. It was a singular coincidence, that he wrote his celebrated Requiem in the immediate prospect of his own death. Most of these letters were written to his father. They exhibit that delicate organization and extreme sensitiveness, to which he fell at last a victim,—for he was of too fine a mould to battle with the poverty and jealousy and opposition which were leagued together, up to the close of his life. The Preface, by the compiler, is an extravagant eulogium; but his letters are full of the freshness and beauty of that noble Art, with which his name is imperishably connected.

HOUSEHOLD PRAYERS, for Four Weeks; with Additional Prayers for Special Occasions. To which is appended a Course of Scripture Reading for every day in the year. By Rev. J. E. RIDDLE, M. A. Revised, with additions and slight alterations, by a Presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church. New York: James Pott. 1866. 12mo., pp. 179.

Among the multitude of books for Family Devotion, this is one of the very best. The language is, as it always should be, simple, ear-



nest, and comprehensive. Its general plan is indicated by the title. The Rev. Dr. Hawks is the American Editor.

PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION, drawn from Nature and Revelation, and applied to Female Education in the Upper Classes. By the Author of "Amy Herbert," etc., etc. Two Volumes in one. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. Small 8vo., pp. 476.

To say that this treatise, by Miss Sewell, is a thoroughly thoughtful work, that it is written with a clear view of the true principles of Christian Ethics, that the writer apprehends, distinctly, the loose and false maxims and theories of Education which pervade English Society, and that these are quite enough to explain the growing influence of Rationalism and Romanism, and that she presents, with great distinctness and power to the Christian mind of the English Church, the nature and province of Education at the present day,—to say all this, is but to intimate the character and importance of the volume. The treatise is wide in its range; embracing the whole circle of virtues, and faults, and habits, and duties, with which Female Education in the Upper Classes has to do. Miss Sewell exhibits a keen insight into the hidden elements and springs of the female character, and the motives of conduct; and her suggestions bear the marks of a wise and successful practical educator. No one not of her sex could write such a book. The ideal kept constantly before her and her readers, is that of a true, noble-hearted, noble minded, English woman. The two chapters on Definite Religious Instruction, are excellent. If they are pertinent in England, much more are they so in this country, where this "moral blue slipper mud" is the foundation on which Society so largely rests, even in the Church. It is an undoubted truth, and an alarming one, that the great mass, even of Church women and Church men, too, know little, and care less, about any definite, steadfast, abiding Faith. God alone can save the Church and the country; or we must get rid of the miserable shams and false notions which are beginning to rule among us, in this fundamental matter of Female Education.

THE CENTENARY OF AMERICAN METHODISM; a Sketch of its History, Theology, Practical System and Success: Prepared by order of the Centenary Committee of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church." By ABEL STEVENS, LL. D. With a statement of the plan of the Centenary Celebration of 1866. By JOHN MCCLINTOCK, D. D. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866. 12mo., pp. 287.

The American Methodists are to celebrate the Centenary Anniversary of the denomination; and they could not have chosen a better man than Dr. Stevens to sound the note of preparation. In this volume he undertakes to show what Methodism is; why it has deserved such general recognition; and what are its capabilities and responsibilities for the future. On all these points, Dr. Stevens' familiarity with the



history of Methodism, enables him to write with great effect. We find some curious statistics in his pages. He says, "during the period from 1800 to 1850, the ratio of the increase of the Ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church has been as 6 to 1, of its communicants as 6 to 1; of the Ministry of the Congregationalists, as 4 to 1, of their communicants, as  $2\frac{2}{3}$  to 1; of the ministry of the regular Baptists, as 4 to 1, of their communicants, as  $5\frac{2}{3}$  to 1; of the ministry of the Presbyterians as 14 to 1, of their communicants as  $8\frac{1}{2}$  to 1; of the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church (North and South) as  $19\frac{3}{4}$  to 1, of its communicants as  $17\frac{3}{4}$  to 1." Now, allowing these numbers to be correct,—and a moment's examination would show how unreliable they are,—yet they are no sort of index to the power and influence upon the country of these Systems of Religion. We give some statistics under our Domestic Intelligence, which present Methodism in a somewhat different light. Dr. Stevens has made the most of his subject; and his book is a suggestive one in several respects.

**DRIFTED SNOW-FLAKES ; or Poetical Gatherings from many Authors.**  
Second Series. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1865.  
12mo. pp., 208.

With not a little of what is nothing else than prose in rhyme, this neat little volume has a few choice gems of genuine poetry. The sentiment, however, is always religious; sometimes it is beautiful; and is, throughout, of a grade to suit the popular taste.

Carlton & Porter, New York, publish the following four works, very neatly, in uniform style, enclose them in a neat case, and call them "The Earnest Christian's Library."

1. **PLAIN WORDS ON CHRISTIAN LIVING.** By CHARLES JOHN VAUGHN, D. D. 12mo., pp. 221.
2. **SURE WORDS OF PROMISE.** 12mo., pp. 196.
3. **THE CROSS OF JESUS ; or Heaven on Earth to me.** By Rev. DAVID THOMPSON. 12mo., pp. 164.
4. **THE SOUL GATHERER.** By the author of "The Way Home," &c. From the tenth London edition. 12mo. pp. 215.

All these are reprints from London editions. The American Methodist Editor, Mr. D. Wise, has altered the two volumes first named, so as to misrepresent the opinions and teaching of the authors; in one case omitting two entire chapters; also inserting words in brackets, and appending notes, and abridging paragraphs; whereby the volumes are made to teach the Methodist doctrine of "Perfection," and some other peculiarities of that denomination. This Mr. Wise, certainly, has a somewhat singular way of teaching "Perfection;" when he thus begins by perverting the language of men quite as pious, learned, and conscientious as himself, and so inculcating sentiments which those men, doubtless, hold in utter abhorrence. A Methodist

Doctor lately took the ground, that the doctrine of Perfection, as held by that denomination, is to be the true note of victory during the next century. Unfortunately for the Doctor, a good many of these Methodists who claim to have experienced "entire sanctification," have a somewhat different reputation among those with whom they are brought into close relations, and who know something of their real character, their tempers, and their daily life.

**WILLSON'S INTERMEDIATE SERIES.** A Third Reader, of a grade between the Second and Third Readers of the School and Family Series. By MARCIUS WILLSON. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 12mo., pp. 216.

The Introduction, of 12 pages, contains the author's admirable summary of the "Elements of Good Reading," in Three Parts, on Articulation, Accent and Emphasis, and Inflections; with Exercises and Rules under each; and to the Lessons, which are well chosen, and beautifully illustrated, are appended brief explanatory Notes, for the use of Teachers and Scholars. The book will be popular and useful.

**JEHOVAH-JIREH; A Treatise on Providence.** By WILLIAM S. PLUMER, D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. 12mo., pp. 233.

The great subject of God's Providence, His special Providence as an ever-present reality and power in the world, is treated by Dr. Plumer in a popular way, and with much force of language, and pertinency of illustration. The author is a Presbyterian divine, and his denominational doctrines and prejudices crop out continually, and sometimes offensively; but the truth is one of great importance and consolation in these days of trial to the nation and the Church.

**JAMES LOUIS PETIGRU.** A Biographical Sketch. By WILLIAM J. GRAYSON. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 12mo., pp. 178.

Mr. Petigru was almost as well known at the North as at the South. Named after his paternal and maternal grandfathers, the one from Ireland, the other a French Huguenot, he exhibited in his character the noblest and strongest traits of those two races. His life has been written by a warm personal friend, and a man of mark in the literary, social and political world. Mr. Petigru, in the very outset, saw the gathering of the storm which has swept over the land, and breasted it in every way, and at all times, even to the very last, with all his might. He predicted everything that has occurred, as the sure result of the War. He died at Charleston, S. C., March 9, 1863, having almost reached the age of 74 years. The biography is the life of an extraordinary man, and is a valuable contribution to the history of the late Civil War.

**THE LIVING FORCES OF THE UNIVERSE.** The Temple and the Worshipers. Know and govern Thyself. By GEORGE W. THOMPSON. Philadelphia: Howard Challen. 1866. 12mo., pp. 358.

The author of this pretentious work claims, that "it offers solutions for many of the Contradictories which have appeared in all the philosophical schools, from the earliest to the present time; and it tenders Conciliations of the Dogmas of all religions, creeds, and superstitions, which are capable of being resolved into a consentaneous, harmonious, and progressive system for the culture and advancement of Humanity." He says, "We are in the Movement of a great Prolepsis," &c., &c. "At such a time, and to such fresh minds, I would commit the gift that has been given to me," &c. Discarding the modern inductive method of reasoning, he says, an "*a priori* cognition of the Divine ideas, the Proleptic Morality, and of the movement forces of nature and life, and the self-possession of the whole, which makes these intelligible, makes him who reaches this union of the divine and human, a son of God, and crowns him with Light and Love." p. 245. The author is perfectly safe in one respect. If he understands himself, no body else is able to understand him; for he studies to use a terminology which has no accepted meaning. The following passage is quite transparent, compared with others. We quote it as an example, for its brevity:—"Man becomes the diaphanous ectype of the inner spiritual self, as he is moulded and moulds his surrounding organisms, from instant to instant, in their animalistic propensities, their human desires and purposes, and in his higher spiritual manifestations of autopsic *willing, intellectualizing and loving.*"

**SYNOPSIS OF THE BIBLE, (Part First,)** containing Questions and Answers on the Old Testament, and on the principal events of Jewish History, from the time of Malachi to the Birth of Christ. By Mrs. D. C. WESTON, author of Calvary Catechism, &c. Church Book Society, 762 Broadway, N. Y.

The Question-Book, with the above title, forms another of Mrs. Weston's admirable series of books of instruction for our Sunday Schools. It has evidently been prepared with great care from the larger standard works on the same subjects, and condenses and simplifies the whole matter, so that while no adult should be ignorant of the facts presented, yet even a child may understand them. The questions have spirit and meaning in them, and the answers are full of matter. It is decidedly the best book for its purpose which we have seen, and we presume it is already extensively in use. If the children of the Church can be well grounded in such facts as are presented in this little volume, there will be little danger to be apprehended that their faith will be shaken, in later life, by the assaults of the infidelity of the latter days, which does not face facts and history, but deals chiefly with intangible subtleties and vague unrealities. Once again we recommend the book as a most serviceable aid in Sunday School instruction.

POEMS, by EDNA DEAN PROCTOR. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 16mo., pp. 140.

POEMS OF FAITH AND AFFECTION. By Mrs. WM. H. MILBURN. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 12mo., pp. 103.

Two daintier, prettier volumes have not lately been issued from the press. We do not care to criticise the "Poems."

The CHURCH BOOK SOCIETY, 762 Broadway, have published the following new books:—

NEW NAMES; or What I wish I were. pp. 48.

FOUR NEW STORIES, by A. L. O. E. pp. 72.

STORIES OF A GOVERNESS. pp. 178.

AMBROSE RODMAN. pp. 62.

MARGARETHE & WALDEMAR. pp. 365.

LOVE AND FEAR. 32mo., pp. 84.

KITTY'S PEARLS AND ROBERT SPENCE'S REVENGE. 32mo., pp. 62.

SPECIMEN OF A CHURCH HYMNAL, Humbly offered for the consideration of those interested. By a Member of the General Convention. Baltimore: 1866. 18mo., pp. 59.

We propose to treat of this little work, and of the subject of Church Hymnody, in the next Number of the Review.

PAPERS OF THE RUSSO-GREEK COMMITTEE, No. IX. Report of the Committee to the General Convention at Philadelphia, October, 1865. 8vo., pp. 24.

This Report to the late General Convention, by the Russo-Greek Committee, gives a concise and well digested statement of what has already been done in the way of opening communication with the Russo-Greek Church, and also valuable statistical information respecting that Church. The Committee has been increased and empowered by the General Convention to prosecute its labors.

THE ECLECTIC MAGAZINE OF FOREIGN LITERATURE. March, 1866. New York: W. H. Bidwell.

This well-established work still maintains its reputation, giving the very cream of the Foreign Periodicals. Every Number always has something of interest and value, and is also embellished with one or more fine Steel Engravings.

The following new publications have been received:—

- THE BELTON ESTATE.** A Novel. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. Author of "Can you Forgive her?" &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 8vo., pp. 140.
- HALF A MILLION OF MONEY.** A Novel. by AMELIA B. EDWARDS. Author of "Barbara's History," &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 8vo., pp. 176.
- GUY DEVERELL.** A Novel. By J. SHERIDAN LE FANU. Author of "Uncle Silas," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 8vo., pp. 149.
- A NOBLE LIFE.** By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 12mo., pp. 302.
- WIVES AND DAUGHTERS.** A Novel. By MRS. GASKELL. Author of "Mary Barton," &c., &c. With Illustrations. New York. 1866. 8vo., pp. 258.
- AGNES.** A Novel. By MRS. OLIPHANT. Author of "The Life of Edward Irving," &c., &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 8vo., pp. 203.
- THE WOMEN OF METHODISM:** Its three Foundresses; Susanna Wesley; the Countess of Huntington; and Barbara Heck; with sketches of their female associates in the early history of the denomination. By ABEL STEVENS, LL. D. A centenary offering to the women of American Methodism, from the American Methodist Ladies' Centenary Association. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866. 12mo., pp. 304.
- THE MEDITERRANEAN ISLANDS:** Sketches and Stories of their Scenery, Customs, History, Painters, &c. By M. G. SLEEPER. With Illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1866. 12mo., pp. 277.
- The Rt. Rev. BISHOP ODENHEIMER's Second Charge, in St. Mary's Church, Burlington, N. J., May 31, 1865. The Church's Power in her Controversy with Antichrist. 8vo., pp. 24.
- The Rt. Rev. BISHOP VAIL's Annual Address, to the Convention of the Diocese of Kansas, in Leavenworth City, Sept. 13, 1865. 8vo., pp. 34.
- The Rt. Rev BISHOP SCOTT's Primary Charge to the Clergy of the Missionary Diocese of Oregon, &c., in St. Stephen's Chapel, Portland, July 3, 1865. 8vo., pp. 34.
- The Rt. Rev. BISHOP SOUTHGATE's Sermon; True Churchmanship, and the Variations from it; in Zion Church, N. Y., Jan. 14, 1866. 8vo., pp. 12.

The Rt. Rev. BISHOP KIP's Sermon; Lessons of the Faith in Europe. In Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, Cal., Nov. 26, 1865. 8vo., pp. 15.

TWO SERMONS ON THE ATONEMENT. I. By the late Rev. Dr. WILSON, Prof., &c., in the Gen. Theo. Seminary, April 23, 1826. II. By the Rev. Dr. S. R. JOHNSON, Prof., in the Gen. Theo. Seminary, Oct. 19, 1851. 12mo., pp. 23, 18.

A great doctrine clearly presented.

The Rev. B. H. PADDOCK's Sermon: The Communion of Saints; in Trinity Church, Houghton, Mich., Aug. 13, 1865. 8vo., pp. 11.

The Rev. WM. N. IRISH's Memorial Sermon, in St. Michael's Church, Geneseo, W. N. Y., Dec. 31st, 1865. 8vo., pp. 24.

Rev. Dr. S. Y. McMASTERS' Sermon, on the General Convention of 1865, in Christ Church, St Paul, Minn., Nov. 5, 1865. 8vo., pp. 9.

EXTRACTS from Woman's Service on the Lord's Day. With a preface by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Rochester, and an Introductory Letter by the American Editor. Philadelphia: McCalla & Stavelly, Printers, 237 Dock Street. 1865. 8vo., pp. 76.

A very valuable exhibition of the practical working of the Church, by Christian women among the poor.

COMPENDIUM OF CANONS, in reference to Candidatship and Holy Orders.

COMPENDIUM OF CANONS, Concerning the duties of Diocesan Standing Committees towards those seeking Candidatship and Holy Orders.

The Rev. B. H. Paddock, of Detroit, Mich., has done a most useful work, in thus freeing our Canons from misapprehension, and so preventing irregularities.

THE THREEFOLD MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH, as Exhibited in Scripture References. By Rev. J. F. Spaulding, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Erie, Penn. 1865. 8vo., pp. 15.

A clear and strong statement of a fundamental principle of Church Order.

FACTS respecting the present state of the Church in Ireland. By the Rev. ALFRED T. LEE, A. M., &c. London: Rivingtons. 1865. 8vo., pp. 19.

These "facts" are a synopsis of details, such as ought to silence clamor against the Irish branch of the Establishment.

A LETTER TO REV. LEONARD BACON, D. D. By J. HALSTED CARROLL. Third Edition. New Haven, Conn. 1866. 12mo., pp. 27.

If the half of what this Letter alleges be true, it only proves, that, if men will not have such Bishops in the Church as the Lord has provided, where right and justice are protected by Law, they will, in the end, and of very necessity, fall under the dominion of an arbitrary intolerable despotism. The scathing language of this Letter exceeds in severity anything which has lately come under our notice.

REUNION OF CONFIRMED. By Rev. Geo. A. LEAKIN, A. M., Rector of Trinity Church, Baltimore. 12mo., pp. 22.

AN EXPLANATORY INTRODUCTION to the Hawaiian Translation of the Book of Common Prayer. By his Majesty, KAMEHAMEHA IV., king of the Sandwich Islands. Philadelphia: 1865. 12mo., pp. 12.

CATALOGUE of Governors, Trustees, Officers, and Alumni of Columbia College. 1754—1864. 1865. 8vo., pp. 112.

CATALOGUE of Hobart College, 1865-66.

CATALOGUE of Trinity College, 1865-66.

CATALOGUE of Yale College, 1865-66.

FIRST ANNUAL Report of St. Luke's Hospital, Detroit, Mich. 1865.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL Report of the Church Charity Foundation. Brooklyn, N. Y. 1866.



# ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

---

## SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

### CONSECRATION OF THE MISSIONARY BISHOP OF COLORADO.

The Consecration of the Rev. GEORGE MAXWELL RANDALL, D.D., as Missionary Bishop of Colorado and parts adjacent, took place in Trinity Church, Boston, on the morning of the Innocents' Day, Thursday, December 28, 1865. The following named Bishops were present. The Rt. Rev. Bishop HOPKINS, of Vermont, presiding Bishop, SMITH of Kentucky, EASTBURN of Massachusetts, CHASE of New Hampshire, CLARK of Rhode Island, VAIL of Kansas, and STALEY of Honolulu. There were also present about eighty Presbyters and Deacons. Morning Prayer was begun by the Rev. E. M. P. Wells, D.D., who read as far as the Psalter, which was read by the Rev. T. W. Snow. The first Lesson was read by the Rev. Mr. Mulchahey. The Rev. Henry Burroughs, Jr., read the second Lesson, and the remaining portion, from the Creed, was said by the Rev. John L. Watson, D.D. A Selection of the Psalms in metre was announced by the Rev. J. P. Robinson, which being sung, the Ante-Communion Service was proceeded with. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Clark read the Commandments, the Epistle was read by the Bishop of Honolulu, and the Gospel by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Chase. The 99th Hymn was then sung, when the Rt. Rev. Bishop Eastburn delivered a discourse, from Acts i. 8: "Ye shall be witnesses unto me."

The Sermon being ended, Bishops Clark and Vail presented the candidate, "vested with his Rochet," to the Presiding Bishop. The testimonials required by the Canons were then read by the Rev. Dr. Balch, of Rhode Island, on the part of the House of Bishops, and by the Rev. John S. B. Hodges, on the part of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The Presiding Bishop called the congregation to prayer, Bishop Smith reciting the Litany. The Presiding Bishop put the usual interrogatories. After the brief prayer said by the Presiding Bishop standing, the Bishop-elect was vested with "the rest of the Episcopal habit" by the Rev. Dr. Payne, and the Rev. S. B. Babcock. Afterwards, all kneeling, *Veni, Creator Spiritus* was sung. The prayers following were next said, and all the Bishops present laying hands upon the head of the Bishop-elect, the Presiding Bishop said the words of Consecration. The Presiding Bishop then proceeded to the administration of the Holy Communion. The *Gloria in Excelsis* was sung, the final prayers were said, and the Benediction pronounced by the Presiding Bishop.

### CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF PITTSBURGH.

The Rev. JOHN BARRETT KERFOOT, D.D., was consecrated Bishop of Pittsburgh, Jan. 25th, 1866, in Trinity Church, Pittsburgh, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hopkins, D.D., LL.D. Presiding Bishop, assisted by the Rt. Rev. Bishops McIlvaine, Whittingham, Williams, Talbot, Cox, and Clarkson. Morning Prayer was begun by the Rev. Mr. Spalding of Erie, the First Lesson (Wisdom v.) being read by the Rev. Mr. Byllesby, and the Second Lesson (Acts xxii.) by the Rev. Richard S. Smith. The Rev. Mr. Fuller said the Nicene Creed, and offered the Collect for St. Paul's day, and prayers following, including one for the Bishop of Pennsylvania, then lying grievously ill. The Bishop of Maryland began the Ante-Communion Service, the Bishop of Nebraska reading the Epistle, and the Assistant Bishop of Indiana the Gospel. The Sermon was preached by the Bishop of Western New York, from Rev. i. 16. The Bishop-elect was presented by the Bishops of Maryland and Connecticut; the evidence of election was read by the Rev. A. Ten Broeck; the con-

sent of the Standing Committees was read by Rev. Prof. Passmore, of Racine College; and of the Bishops, by Rev. Henry Edwards, of Hagerstown, Md.; the Litany was said by the Bishop of Connecticut; the Canonical promises were then read by the Bishop-elect, and all present united in the laying on of hands. The Communion Service followed, and the Blessing of Peace was pronounced by the Presiding Bishop.

## ORDINATIONS.

## DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Brown, John Wesley,	Whittingham,	Feb. 25, 1866,	Mt. Calvary, Baltimore, Md.
Buell, Clarence,	Potter,	Feb. 25, "	St. John's, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Carlton, Hiram,	Eastburn,	Mar. 6, "	Emmanuel, Boston, Mass.
Chandler, Saml. Poole,	Whipple,	Dec. 20, 1865,	Christ, Red Wing, Minn.
Colton, R. Francis,	Vail,	Feb. 21, 1866,	Atonement, Philadelphia, Pa.
Flower, Abm. B.	McCaskry,	Jan. 7, "	St. Paul's, Lansing, Mich.
Gadsden, Thomas F.	Davis,	Jan. 24, "	St. Luke's, Charleston, S. C.
Haughton, James Jr.	Eastburn,	Mar. 6, "	Emmanuel, Boston, Mass.
Howard, DeWitt C.	Whitehouse,	Nov. 30, 1865,	Bishop's Church, Chicago, Ill.
Johnson, John,	Davis,	Jan. 7, 1866,	Grace, Camden, S. C.
Smith, Watson M., D.D.	Eastburn,	Mar. 6, "	Emmanuel, Boston, Mass.
Salt, William M.	Coxe,	Feb. 25, "	St. Paul's, Syracuse, W.N.Y.
Scott, John,	Whipple,	Nov. 26, 1865,	St. Mark's Chapel, Minneapolis, Minn.
Talbot, Richard,	Talbot,	Jan. 14, 1866,	St. John's, Louisville, Ky.
Winslow, Frank W.	Eastburn,	Mar. 6, "	Emmanuel, Boston, Mass.

## PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Batterson, Herm. G.	Whipple,	Dec. 20, 1865,	Christ, Red Wing, Minn.
" Bellam, Thos. L.	Talbot,	Feb. 4, 1866,	Trinity, Michigan City, Ind.
" Bradley, E. A.	Burgess,	Dec. 12, 1865,	St. Philip's, Wiscasset, Maine.
" Brooke, Benj. F.	Whittingham,	Dec. 24, "	Christ, Baltimore, Md.
" Brown, J. Eastburn,	Vail,	Feb. 21, 1866,	Atonement, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Brown, Thos. McKee,	Potter,	Feb. 25, "	St. John's, Brooklyn, N. Y.
" Coster, Robt. John,	Whittingham,	Feb. 25, "	Mt. Calvary, Baltimore, Md.
" Curtis, Josiah F.	Johns,	Dec. 16, 1865,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
" Doty, Wm. D'Orville,	Eastburn,	Jan. 25, 1866,	St. Paul's, Boston, Mass.
" De Garmo, H. H.	Whitehouse,	Nov. 30, 1865,	Bishop's Church, Chicago, Ill.
" Dymond, William,	Potter,	Feb. 18, 1866,	Holy Trinity, N. York City.
" Ely, Foster,	Potter,	Mar. 3, "	Holy Comforter, Eltingville, S. I., N. York.
" Hendley, Chas. J.	Whitehouse,	Nov. 30, 1865,	Bishop's Church, Chicago, Ill.
" Kramer, J. W.	Potter,	Jan. 17, 1866,	Grace, Jersey City, N. J.
" Knowles, J. Harris,	Whitehouse,	Nov. 30, 1865,	Bishop's Church, Chicago, Ill.
" McGowan, James,	Whitehouse,	Nov. 30, "	Bishop's Church, Chicago, Ill.
" Payne, John Wm.	Potter,	Mar. 3, 1866,	Holy Comforter, Eltingville, S. I., N. York.
" Pindell, A. T.	Whittingham,	Dec. 24, 1865,	Christ, Baltimore, Md.
" Post, Richard B.	Potter,	Feb. 25, 1866,	St. John's, Brooklyn, N. Y.
" Rafter, W. W.	Kemper,	Dec. 27, 1865,	St. Matthew's, Kenosha, Wis.
" Ray, J. Wainwright,	McCaskry,	Dec. 19, "	St. Peter's, Tecumseh, Mich.
" Scripture, James O.	Eastburn,	Jan. 25, 1866,	St. Paul's, Boston, Mass.
" Sweetland, Lucius,	Coxe,	Dec. 24, 1865,	St. James', Batavia, W.N.Y.
" Stewart, Charles,	Lee,	Dec. 31, "	Chapel, Davenport, Iowa.
" Wagner, Edwin A.	Potter,	Feb. 18, 1866,	Holy Trinity, N. York City.

## CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Gethsemane,	Whipple,	Dec. 14, 1865,	Minneapolis, Minn.
Grace,	Coxe,	Jan. 6, 1866,	Elmira, W. N. York.
Holy Trinity,	Potter,	Dec. 21, 1865,	New York City.
St. Paul's,	Potter,	Dec. 28, "	Yonkers, N. York.
St. Stephen's,	Talbot,	Jan. 17, 1866,	Terre Haute, Ind.
Trinity,	Coxe,	Dec. 14, 1865,	Canaseraga, W. N. York.
Trinity,	Williams,	Feb. 10, 1866,	Northfield, Conn.
Trinity,	Kerfoot,	Jan. 30, "	Newcastle, Pittsburg, Pa.

## OBITUARIES.

The REV. EDWARD WINTHROP, Rector of St. John's Church, Highgate, Vermont, died in New York City, Oct. 21st, 1865, aged 54 years. He was born in New Haven, Conn., in 1811; graduated at Yale College in 1831, with the second honors of his class, and in the same class with the Rt. Rev. Bishops Clark and Kip; studied Theology in the Taylorite Divinity School at New Haven, and in Virginia; was ordained Deacon, by Bishop Smith, in Christ Church, Lexington, Ky., Oct. 30th, 1836; and Priest, by the same Bishop, in the same Church, Nov. 13, 1837; in 1842, he removed to Ohio, and was Rector of Parishes in Marietta, Norwalk, and Maumee City. His voice failing, he became Principal of a Female Seminary. In 1864, removed to Highgate, Vt., and became Rector of St. John's Church. Mr. Winthrop was an excellent linguist, and in his knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek of the Holy Scriptures, he had few superiors.

REV. MATTHEW M. GILBERT died at Wellsville, Ohio, No. 14th, 1865, aged 31 years. He was born, we believe, at Worthington, Ohio; graduated at Kenyon College in 1861; and at the Seminary in 1864; was ordained Deacon at Gambier, May 30, 1864, by Bishop McIlvaine; and Priest June 23, by the same Bishop. His Ministry was spent in Wellsville, East Liverpool, Ohio, and parts adjacent.

The REV. CADWALLADER GOLDEN HOFFMAN, Missionary to Africa, died at Cape Palmas, Nov. 25, 1865, aged 46 years. Born in New York City, educated at Columbia College, a graduate of the Alexandria Theol. Seminary, he was ordained Deacon in Epiphany Church, Philadelphia, June 29, 1848, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Alonzo Potter. Though he inherited affluence and luxury, he laid all on the Altar of Christ; and for nearly sixteen years he has been a self-denying and successful Missionary to the colonists at Cape Palmas, and the heathen tribes in the interior. His reports in the Spirit of Missions have made the Church acquainted with the man and his work. He died a victim to that inhospitable climate. A truer Missionary spirit has not been witnessed in the Church.

The REV. HENRY WILLIAM DUCHACET, D. D., Rector of St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, died in that City, Dec. 13, 1865, aged 68 years. On entering upon public life, he was at first a Physician in New York City, of much promise. About forty-two years ago he was

ordained to the Sacred Ministry, and having filled several important positions, in 1833 he accepted the Rectorship of St. Stephen's Parish, Philadelphia. For many years he was a leading member of the Standing Committee of that Diocese, in which position his superior learning gave him great influence; in the conventions he was always prominent. He has also been associated with most of the religious societies of the Diocese, for years an interested member of the Society for the Advancement of Christianity in Pennsylvania, of the Church Hospital, the Society for the Relief of Widows and Orphans of the Clergy, and the Bishop White Prayer Book Society. By his agency a great charity was inaugurated, and the Burd Asylum for Orphans will ever stand a monument to his memory and a proof of his influence, as a pastor, with the members of his congregation. Dr. Duchacet had devoted his handsome property to a most worthy object, the establishment of an Asylum for Disabled Clergymen, and had already taken the preliminary steps to make the legal provisions for that purpose. This noble design has been frustrated by his sudden death, he having died without making his will.

THE REV. CHARLES CLEVELAND, Rector of Trinity Church, East New York, died Tuesday, Dec. 19, 1865.

THE REV. ALFRED BAURY, D. D. died at Boston, Dec. 26, 1865. He was of French descent, and brother-in-law of the late Bishop Henshaw. His first Parish was in Guilford, Vt.; became Rector of St. Mary's, Newton Lower Falls, in Mass., in 1822, and so continued until April, 1851. He then officiated in St. Mark's, Boston, and at the time of his death was Rector of Trinity, Bridgewater, and St. Paul's, Hopkinton. He was a good reader and preacher, and a man of sterling character. He received the Honorary Degree of D. D., from Norwich University.

THE REV. JOSEPH F. PHILIPS, Rector of Trinity Church, Niles, Michigan, died at Niles, Jan. 30, aged 63 years. He was born in Belfast, Maine; graduated at Brown University; he read law in the office of Judge Betts, an eminent lawyer of New York, was admitted to the bar, and commenced practice under very favorable auspices. Law, however, becoming distasteful to him, on the recommendation of Bishop Hobart, he became a candidate for Orders, studied Divinity with the late Doctor Berrien, and was ordained by Bishop Onderdonk about 1832. His first parish was at Islip, Long Island; next, North Hempstead; then Catskill; Middlebury, Vermont; Spottswood, New Jersey; and Niles, Michigan, where he took charge in 1858, and remained until his death.

THE REV. ALPHEUS GEER, M. A., died in Norwich, Conn., Feb. 3, 1866, aged 78 years. He was born in Kent, Conn., Aug. 7, 1788; fitted for College at Cheshire, under the Rev. Tillotson Bronson, D. D.; graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1813; was ordained Deacon in Christ Church, New York, by Bishop Hobart, June 12,

1814; and Priest, in Christ Church, Middletown, Conn., by Bishop Griswold, in 1815. His first Parish was St. John's, Waterbury, Conn., of which he was Rector sixteen and a half years; he was then Rector of St. Peter's, Hebron, Conn., fifteen years; and subsequently was Rector of St. Stephen's, East Haddam, and St. John's, North Guilford. His last missionary work was in the Parish of Christ Church, Harwinton. Having labored quietly and unostentatiously for fifty years as Christ's Minister, he died in the full confidence of a certain faith. His burial was from Christ Church, Norwich, Feb. 6th; the Rev. Messrs. Mackie, Banks, and Adams officiating.

The REV. NATHANIEL O. PRESTON, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Manhattan, Kansas, died at that place Feb. 14, 1866. In 1858 he removed from Philadelphia, where he had previously been settled, to Kansas, and organized the Parish in Manhattan; in 1858 he became Rector of Grace Church, Topeka, and Principal of the Diocesan Female Seminary; in 1864, he returned to the Parish at Manhattan, and also became Professor in the State Agricultural College there located.

The REV. INTREPID MORSE, D. D., formerly Rector of St. Paul's Church, Steubenville, Ohio, died Feb. 15, 1866.

The REV. CHARLES E. PLEASANTS died in Flushing, N. Y., March 13, aged 58 years. He was a native of Pennsylvania, by birth a Quaker; was ordained by Bishop Moore in Va., in 1835; removed to Maryland in 1839, and became Rector of South-Sassafras, Kent; in 1842 was Rector of All Faith's, St. Mary's; in 1843, of St. Andrew's and resigned in ill health. He has resided mostly in Washington City.

#### CONVERSIONS TO THE CHURCH.

Mr. JOHN WRIGHT, lately a licentiate among the Congregationalists, has become a Candidate for Holy Orders in Delaware.

Rev. RICHARD TALBOT, lately ordained Deacon by Bishop Talbot, was formerly a Methodist.

The REV. JOSEPH CROSS, D.D., of North Carolina, formerly a distinguished Methodist divine, and author of several popular works, among them "Travels in Europe," and "Views from Pisgah," has applied for Holy Orders in the Church.

Of the nineteen persons confirmed recently in Saginaw City, Mich., not one had been brought up in the Church, several of them having been members of the Presbyterian and Methodist societies.

Rev. W. J. JOHNSON, lately a Presbyterian Minister, has been admitted Candidate for Holy Orders in Minnesota.

Rev. Mr. CHANDLER, lately ordained Deacon in Minnesota, was formerly a Methodist Minister.

MESSRS. MATSON M. SMITH, D. D., HIRAM CARLTON, JAMES HAUGHTON, Jr., and FRANK WINSLOW, lately ordained Deacons in Mass., were all from the Trinitarian Congregational Sect. A writer says: "One had been a Minister in that sect for the space of twenty-seven years; another, also a Minister, had received an honorary doctorate; another was the son of a Minister and Doctor of Divinity; and the fourth was the son of a Deacon in one of the Boston Congregational parishes. All the Clergy officiating as presenters, and in the desk and pulpit, were, with one exception, educated as Congregationalists. These facts were so marked and so well known that they were the occasion of several very bitter articles which have appeared in the sectarian and secular prints."

Mr. JOHN WESLEY BROWN, lately ordained Deacon in Baltimore, was formerly a Methodist Minister.

Mr. THEODORE M. CARSON, and Mr. ISAAC GIBSON, formerly Methodist Preachers, have been recommended for Holy Orders in Virginia.

#### ALABAMA.

The Council of the Church in this Diocese met in Montgomery Jan. 17. On the reassembling of the Council at 4 o'clock P. M., the Committee on the ecclesiastical relations of the Diocese made their report, which, after a few verbal amendments, was adopted *nem. con.*, as follows:

*Whereas*, The Diocese of Alabama, in the year of our Lord, 1861, recognizing the fact that the State of Alabama had placed herself under the jurisdiction of a new government, deemed it highly expedient and necessary to sever, and did sever, her former legislative connection with the General Convention of the Prot. Episcopal Church in the United States, and with other Dioceses, did subsequently organize a new synodical body, known as the Prot. Episcopal Church in the Confederate States; and

*Whereas*, The State of Alabama now recognizes herself to be within the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America; and,

*Whereas*, The General Council of the Church in the late Confederate States, at its recent session, did declare, as its judgment, that it is perfectly consistent with the good faith which she owes to the Bishops and Dioceses with which she has been in union since 1862 for any Diocese to decide for herself whether she will any longer continue in union with said Council, and did provide a mode of withdrawal therefrom: and,

*Whereas*, It is most consonant with the usages of the Church Catholic for all the Dioceses within the bounds of the same civil jurisdiction to be united in synodical action as well as by intercommunion, where such union involves no sacrifice of Catholic principle or the disregard of motives of high expediency pertaining to the well-being and efficiency of the Church: and,

*Whereas*, This Council cordially reciprocates the spirit of charity which prevailed in the proceedings of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, at its late session in Philadelphia: and,

*Whereas*, No Christian nor Christian body can, without showing full and sufficient cause, on the grounds of Holy Scripture and Catholic tradition, rightly remain isolated and apart from such union as may most conduce to the peace, prosperity and efficiency of Christ's Church: therefore,

*Resolved*, I. That the Diocese of Alabama hereby withdraws from her union with the aforesaid General Council.



II. That the Diocese of Alabama hereby accedes to and adopts the Constitution and Canons of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

III. That by this adoption of the Constitution and Canons of the General Convention, the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese of Alabama are necessarily so changed as to conform to the new relations thus established.

IV. That the foregoing action shall be considered as duly accomplished when official notice thereof shall have been given to the Bishops remaining in connection with the General Council, as required by said Council.

V. That duly certified copies of the foregoing Preamble and Resolutions be transmitted to the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and to the Secretary of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the General Convention.

The Right Rev. Bishop then delivered an address to the Council, setting forth his personal views and preliminary steps touching the future ecclesiastical relations of the Diocese, and a detailed account of the interference of the military authorities with the ecclesiastical affairs of the Church in Alabama.

The Council then took a recess for Divine service; after which, with an able sermon by the Bishop, and the Administration of the Apostolic Rite of Confirmation, the Council resumed its session, and unanimously endorsed the action of the Bishop, with cordial and grateful appreciation of his consistent, manly and Christian maintenance of the independent authority of the Church in matters purely ecclesiastical; and, after suitable devotions, the Council adjourned, *sine die*.

#### RETURN OF ALABAMA TO UNION WITH THE CHURCH.

By the last General Convention, the way was provided by which the Diocese of Alabama might return to Union with the Church, the Rev. Richard Hooker Wilmer, D. D., having been elected and consecrated Bishop of the Diocese during the temporary separation. The conditions were, that he should transmit in writing,—to be signed by him in presence of three Bishops of this Church,—to the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops, the promise of conformity comprised in the Office for the Consecration of Bishops; and that he should also transmit to the said Presiding Bishop the letters of his Consecration, or in default of the existence of such letters, other sufficient evidence as to the fact of his Consecration, and the Bishops by whom it was done, and the other persons by whom it was witnessed. These conditions were complied with, in Trinity Chapel, New York, Jan. 31, 1866. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Wilmer was attended by the Rev. Mr. Nevius, one of his Presbyters. The Bishops present were, the Rt. Rev. Horatio Potter, D. D., D. C. L., of this Diocese, the Rt. Rev. John Williams, D. D., of Connecticut, and the Rt. Rev. Alexander Gregg, D. D., of Texas, and a number of Presbyters. The Rt. Rev. Bishop of Connecticut introduced Bishop Wilmer, and read the letter of the Southern Bishops, certifying the facts of his due election and consecration; after which, Bishop Wilmer, in a clear, distinct, and very solemn manner, pronounced the following formula:

"In the name of God, Amen. I, Richard Hooker Wilmer, chosen Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Alabama, do promise conformity and obedience to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. So help me God, through Jesus Christ."

The administration of the Holy Communion followed, in which Bishop Wilmer was celebrant. He also addressed the students of the General Theological Seminary, who were in attendance. The four Bishops then returned to the sacristy, where the written copy of the Episcopal Oath was duly signed and attested, and all the papers were put in order to be forwarded to the presiding Bishop.

The thanks of the whole Church are due to Bishop Wilmer for the firmness with which he resisted a despotic military order, and secured at last the acknowledgment of that liberty to the Church, which is guaranteed by the Constitution. Neither threats, nor insults, nor the misrepresentations of a partisan press, could drive him from his purpose.



## SOUTH CAROLINA.

The Council of the Church in this Diocese met at Charleston, Feb. 14th. At this Council the committee appointed to report on so much of the Bishop's Address as refers to the relation of this Diocese to other Dioceses, unanimously recommend the adoption of a preamble and resolutions.

The resolutions are as follows:

*Resolved*, 1st. That the Diocese of South Carolina having constituted with the Dioceses lately associated with her a branch of the Church Catholic distinct from that with which she had been previously connected in the United States, does now proceed to withdraw from her present synodical union and to return to that in which she had been with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

2d. That accordingly all such parts of our present constitution, canons, and other legislation as are inconsistent with the preceding resolution, are hereby declared to be henceforth of no force.

3d. That copies of the foregoing preamble and resolutions, duly certified by the Bishop and Secretary of the Diocese, shall be sent, one to the Bishops of the Dioceses (if there be any) in connection with the General Council, the other to the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and to the House of Deputies of the General Convention of said Church, together with copies of the Journals of all the Councils of this Diocese since 1861 inclusive, with the request that they be laid before both Houses of the next General Convention.

In behalf of the Committee.

PAUL TRAPIER, Chairman.

The Report of the Committee was unanimously adopted. The Bishop in his Address said:

"Our seminary buildings have been all destroyed by fire, and two-thirds of the books burnt up with them; its funds, also, are almost entirely lost. This is a great bereavement. Our Professors are waiting, and anxious to discharge their duties; our candidates are earnestly desiring to assemble together, and pursue their studies; but there is no seminary; there is none to invite them, nor to supply their necessities. This is one of the severest strokes this Diocese has felt."

"I have never known such large congregations filling the courts of the Lord's House, as those which I have met since I last left home; and I am persuaded that the Church is now stronger than ever in the hearts of her people. The list of confirmations also, since our last meeting, making the due allowances for the number of churches closed, the colored population separated from us, and so large a portion of the white, absent, is in fair proportion to that of any previous period, and probably exceeds it. I have been endeavoring, for some time past, to inform myself as to what are the prospects of the Church in the Diocese in relation to her colored members. I have not complete statistics, but am convinced, from observation and information, that in all cases where the colored population shall be reinstated in their former localities they will return to the communion of the Church."

The Convention passed appropriate resolutions in memory of JACOB J. SASS, Esq., who has deceased during the past year. He was one of the noblest of all the laymen who have adorned the history of the American Church. We record his name as an affectionate tribute to his many Christian virtues.

## CHURCH IN GEORGIA.

The following notice has been forwarded to the Presiding Bishop:—

*To the Right Rev. John H. Hopkins, D. D., Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church:—*

RT. REV. AND DEAR BROTHER:—I have to-day given official notice to my brethren who were, for a time united with me in the Ecclesiastical Confederation of the Southern Dioceses, of my withdrawal from that Confederation, and of the return of Georgia to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. With your consent, I will issue a Pastoral to my Diocese, informing the clergy and laity of my action.

With the sincerest affection, I am, Rt. Rev. and Dear Brother,

Very truly yours,

STEPHEN ELLIOTT, *Bishop of Georgia*

SAVANNAH, GA., Jan. 3, 1866.

## CHURCH IN FLORIDA.

We place on record the *Preamble and Resolutions* adopted by the Diocesan Council of Florida, which met in Tallahassee on the 22d of February: an attested copy of which has been received by the Presiding Bishop:—

*Whereas*, the Diocese of Florida, in the year of our Lord 1863, recognizing the fact that the State of Florida had placed herself under the jurisdiction of the Confederate States, did sever her former connection with the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and did unite herself to the General Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States; and

*Whereas*, the State of Florida now recognizes herself to be within the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America; therefore

*Resolved*, 1st. That the Diocese of Florida hereby withdraws from her union with the aforesaid General Council, and accedes to and adopts the Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

2d. That by this adoption of the Constitution and Canons of the General Convention, the Constitution and Canons of the Diocese of Florida are necessarily so changed as to conform to the new relations thus established.

3d. That duly certified copies of the above resolutions be transmitted to the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and to the Secretary of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

4th. That notice of the action of this Council be conveyed to the Bishops remaining in connection with the General Council.

The foregoing Preamble and Resolutions were unanimously adopted in the Diocesan Council of Florida, on the 22d of February, 1866.

A true copy from the Minutes.

Attest,

F. EPPES,

Secretary of the Diocesan Council of Florida.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

From the Rt. Rev. Bishop Atkinson's Address to his Convention, we extract the following, as showing the present condition of his Diocese. The description will equally apply to large portions of South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Tennessee:—

November 26, 1865.—He visited Newbern, preached twice, administered the Communion, and confirmed five persons. The next day he baptized a child in private. The confirmations would have been more numerous, but that the Church had been without a resident Rector for more than four years. Its prosperity is now likely to be very great, the business and population of the place being considerably increased, and the judgment of many persons, not heretofore of our Communion, inclining them, in the presence of recent facts, to unite themselves with it. The Rev. Mr. Forbes, recently elected Rector, has now entered on his duties.

December 2d.—The Bishop preached at Trinity Church, Beaufort county, confirmed eight persons and administered the Communion. This congregation has suffered very much during the war, but is now likely to be re-established.

December 3.—He preached twice in Washington, confirmed seven persons, and administered the Communion. There were present of the Clergy, the Rector, the Rev. Wm. Geer, and also Messrs. Hughes, Kennerley, Harding and Eborn. The services were performed in the Court House, three-fourths of the town having been destroyed in the progress of the war, and every house of worship but one little chapel.

December 6.—At Plymouth he preached, confirmed three persons, and administered the Communion. This town is more than ruined by the war; it is almost effaced from existence. Probably not more than one in twenty of the houses is standing. There is no Church in which a Congregation can worship, but the Episcopal, and that, which was never finished, has been struck and injured by shot and shells, has been desecrated by being used as a sleeping place and kitchen for soldiers, and wandering bands of colored people, and can only be made fit for use by a considerable outlay of money. Still, as all must worship here, who worship at all, there was a tolerable congregation, and efforts are being made to put the building in order.

## GLORIOUS PROSPECTS OF A UNITED CHURCH.

It gives us pleasure unspeakable to put on record the fact that the Church, North and South, is once more united, and that "the spirit of truth, unity, and concord" again prevails throughout our borders. The Brethren, North and South, are meeting, as of old, in that fraternal confidence which the love of Christ alone can beget, and are joining heart to heart and hand to hand in one common cause. The devastations of the War, which have carried ruin in their fiery, bloody path to so many Churches, and parsonages, and parishes, are appealing to the best feelings of Northern Churches; and are receiving a response, cordial, prompt; certainly in some degrees, fitting; and in every sense gratifying, in that it is the result of no spasmodic excitement, but of a deep, genuine, Christian sentiment.

We cannot specify all the various forms and instances in which this Christian liberality has been exhibited. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Gregg has received a special gift of ten thousand dollars from a single individual, and the Domestic Committee have at once adopted the six Missionaries whom he nominated; and their quarterly salaries have been paid in advance. The Rt. Rev. Bishop Atkinson, also, has received a similar proof of Christian kindness on the part of the Committee; who have placed on their list of Missionaries the twenty-six names nominated by the Bishop. The other Southern Dioceses have been met, and we are sure will be met, without exception, in the same fraternal spirit. What blessings are in store, for the Church and the country, if this blessed work shall be prosecuted faithfully!

We may well note the contrast to all this which we see around us. As one illustration, we give the following. In the *Presbyterian Banner* (of Pittsburgh, Penn.), of March 14th, we find the following fire-brand scattered among that denomination:—"Could I gain the ear of every Evangelical Church in the North, and were I capable of uttering one fervent, persuasive word, that word should be this—*carry the Gospel to the millions of freedmen while you can. Depend upon it, access to them will be denied you just as soon as the popular will there is allowed to go forth. Now the door is open. Enter in, and you at once, and for ever, enable the black man to assert for himself the right to hear the Gospel on the basis of the "Great Commission," and not according to the caprice of his late master. But allow things to revert to their old channels, as they must when the military are withdrawn, and from the denser and more needy masses of the late slaves, you will certainly be cut off for a whole generation—possibly for many. Again I say, enter in; enter in by thousands before the door be shut: and then the negro will be able to keep it open.*" The effect of all this upon the South we need not describe. Resolutions and protests, criminalations and recriminations, alienation and bitterness, are rending these Sects hopelessly.

Nor is this all. The Infidel Humanitarianism of the North, which, a few months ago, was boasting in its Conventions of the conquests it was about to win, already begins to open its eyes to the reality of its true position. A correspondent of the *Christian Register* (Unitarian), in a letter from Baltimore, gives it as his opinion, that the expectations cherished by many last spring, that their "liberal theology" was in a fair way to overspread the South, are doomed to a sore disappointment. He says:

"I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, and shall be most happy to find myself mistaken—and will make a most splendid *amende* through your columns if I am—but I do not believe any of the places at which our men have gone can be held; that there is any persistent vitality in them, with the exception of Washington, which the association has got to hold at large cost as a missionary station, if the Church is to be sustained at all. St. Louis, Louisville, and Baltimore will be the outer line of posts of the denomination. The fact is, Unitarianism is looked at not only as a Northern, but as a Massachusetts idea, and that is enough. They have suffered too much from Massachusetts ideas. They will not hear it. You may get Unitarianism at Charleston if it come from an Englishman, but not if it come from a New-Englander—and Charleston is the only real live society we ever had at the South."

## ANTI-SLAVERY AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION.

The following official paper is so important in the history of the country, that we give it for preservation and convenient reference in our pages:—

*William H. Seward, Secretary of State of the United States, to all to whom these presents may come greeting:*

*Know ye, that, whereas the Congress of the United States on the 1st of February last passed a resolution submitting to the legislature of the several States a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States,*

*Resolved, By the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, two-thirds of both Houses concurring, that the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States, as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said Legislatures, shall be valid to all intent and purposes as a part of said Constitution, namely:*

ARTICLE XIII—SECTION I.—Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

SECT. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

*And, whereas, it appears from the official document on file in this Department, that the amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed as aforesaid, has been ratified by the Legislatures of the States of Illinois, Rhode Island, Michigan, Maryland, New York, West Virginia, Maine, Kansas, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Ohio, Missouri, Nevada, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Vermont, Tennessee, Arkansas, Connecticut, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Alabama, North Carolina, and Georgia, in all twenty-seven States;*

*And, whereas, the whole number of States in the United States is thirty-six.*

*And, whereas, The before especially named States, whose Legislatures have ratified the said proposed amendment, constitute three-fourths of the whole number of States in the United States;*

Now, therefore, be it known that I, William H. Seward, Secretary of State of the United States, by virtue and in pursuance of the second section of the Act of Congress approved the 20th of April, 1818, entitled "An act to provide for the publication of the laws of the United States and for other purposes," do hereby certify that the amendment aforesaid has become valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution of the United States.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this eighteenth day of December, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the ninetyeth.

WM. H. SEWARD, Secretary of State.

## OPEN VIOLATION OF CANONS IN NEW YORK CITY.

The following paragraph was taken from a secular newspaper of Feb. 26th:

"A PRESBYTERIAN IN AN EPISCOPAL PULPIT.—On Sunday evening, a Presbyterian clergyman, the Rev. Dr. Craven, contrary to the injunctions of Bishop Potter's Pastoral, [and in defiance of a special letter from the Bishop to Dr. Smith], preached in the Rev. John Cotton Smith's (Episcopal) Church, corner of 5th avenue and 10th street, his subject being "Christian Unity." The presence of a dissenting clergyman in an Episcopal pulpit attracted a large congregation to the edifice. The Rev. gentleman referred in his address to the necessity of Unity in all the Evangelical Churches."

Such gross, wanton violation of Law and Order, and of Canonical vows made at Ordination, is occasioning no little surprise out of New York, where all the facts are not known. Both Clergymen and laymen, especially where the Church is a feeble minority, and who in their Parishes are suffering intensely from the moral effect of such misconduct, are expressing great uneasiness that such deliberate trampling

upon Church Law and Church principle, in such a place as the City of New York, is suffered to pass by unnoticed. Such persons may not know, that, in this instance of disorder, and in other similar ones that have occurred, there has been an evidently studied plan to dodge the letter of Rubrics and Canons, under the pretence that, on these several occasions, the Church was merely loaned for some special Service; full and regular Services for "the Congregation of this Church" having been previously held. And yet in the face of all this, these disorderly services are represented by these Episcopal Clergymen, to outsiders, as specially intended to be an official, public, formal recognition of the validity of Non-Episcopal Orders; and as such they are claimed and gazetted in the Non-Episcopal organs.

Nay, more. These disorderly Church Clergymen are insisting before the public that these services are meant as "the vindication of this right" of "Pulpit Exchanges." At a meeting of the "Christian Union Association," in St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, on Sunday evening, March 11th, at which meeting a preacher of Socinianism took a prominent part, the Rev. Mason Gallagher (Episcopal), is reported to have delivered himself as follows. He said he "had once been a firm believer in the absurd doctrine of the Apostolic succession, but the vision, as that of Peter of the clean and unclean beasts, had shown him that no one whom God accepts as a Minister should be refused."

The *Episcopal Recorder*, of Jan. 13, 1866, says: "We feel that the Church owes to him [the Rev. John Cotton Smith, D.D.], and his brethren who have vindicated this right, a debt of gratitude. They have shown by their conduct, that the Church does not *practically* hold the exclusive and unchurching dogma, as they have demonstrated, by their replies to Bishop POTTER, that she never embodied it in her articles or ordinal, as a doctrine. It is a matter of comparatively small moment how extensively or restrictedly *this now fully vindicated right of pulpit exchanges* should be practised. It is enough for the great cause of Christian Union, that it is *now fully and incontestibly established*."

So far as this whole question is one of argument, it has been met in previous numbers of this Review. Concerning these late developments, we have now two things to say.

1st. How much such a sort of recognition of Non-Episcopal Orders as this, made under such circumstances, is really worth to the parties concerned, we leave to be decided by the gentlemanly instincts of the Non-Episcopal preachers, who have lent themselves as tools to what they very well know to be a mere faction. Besides, this contentiousness in the Church has revealed several things concerning the denominational ministers of the City. Not a few of them have shown themselves to be Christian gentlemen. They have steadfastly kept aloof from all these attempts to get up a Church quarrel. They understand the Church's position in this matter as well as we do; and they only respect Churchmen the more for their consistency. They say, and say openly, that if we may not look for fidelity to the most solemn pledges here, we cannot look for it any where; and that such things as loyalty to principle, and confidence in men, are an illusion. Some of them, who have been drawn into the game, are understood to have expressed their regret at ever having had anything to do with such a business. Some of these denominational ministers regard the whole question of Orders as of no great importance; whether there are in the Christian Ministry, one, two, or three Orders, or no Orders at all, of course they lose nothing by entering our pulpits, and gain everything; while we lose everything, and gain nothing. Some of these denominational preachers, who have mingled in these broils, evince plainly enough that they hate the Church with intense hatred; and are willing to play into the hands of men, whom they flatter to their faces, but whose inconsistency they despise, and laugh at behind their backs; while, at the same time, they are accomplishing their own partizan and selfish ends.

2nd. The other thing which we have to say is this. This question of the "right of pulpit exchanges," instead of being "now fully and incontestibly established," lacks a good deal of any such settlement. If they who think otherwise, will give a little manliness to their defiance of Church Law and Church principle, so that, in an authoritative and formal decision, the question can be met, fairly and squarely, on its own merits, and where there shall be no chance for quibblings and evasions,

we venture the prediction, that it will be very soon determined whether these gentlemen are right or wrong, in their practical interpretation of Rubrics and Canons. Will they, as honest men, test this question in this way? and so put an end to further strife and contention? We shall see.

#### REFORMATION OF THE ITALIAN CHURCH.

At the last General Convention, after a warm debate, the following resolution was adopted:

"This Convention learns with great satisfaction, by information from various sources, that there is much encouragement to hope for a return of the Italian Churches to the primitive purity of doctrine, discipline, and worship, together with their revival in Christian liberty and zeal, and that it heartily sympathizes with the earnest members of those Churches, both of the Clergy and the laity, who are laboring to that effect; and that it humbly prays the great Head of the Church to crown the efforts now making in that direction with His blessing."

A committee was appointed to sit during the recess to collect Italian information, and report to the next Convention. This committee, we are assured, are already in possession of facts of very great significance. The subject will be presented more fully in the next Number of this Review. Meanwhile, to show the spirit which rules at Rome, we give the following extract of a dispatch addressed by Mr. Odo Russell to the Earl of Clarendon, dated Rome, February 8:—

"Travellers visiting the Pope's dominions should be very careful not to bring forbidden books or Colt's revolvers with them, the custom-house officers having strict orders to confiscate them, and it is not always possible to recover them after the owners have left the Roman States. Forbidden books are those condemned by the Congregation of the Index, books on religion or morality in general, political and philosophical works of every description, and more especially Italian religious tracts published in London. *But above all, travellers should be careful not to bring English, Italian, or other Bibles with them, the Bible being strictly prohibited.*"

The Rev. T. B. Lyman, a Presbyterian of the American Church, has commenced Services in a large room under the same roof with the apartments of the American Minister, which are fully attended. At no distant day, an American Church will be demanded and erected at Rome for all who choose to attend. Our own Government cannot too soon have its attention called to such a reciprocal right. We shall then see how the question will be met by Romanists, both *here* and there. American residents at Rome should petition our Government on the subject.

#### NATIONAL CONGREGATIONAL COUNCIL.

In June and July last, a Convention of leading Congregationalists in the country, was held in Boston, which continued in session several days. Over five hundred delegates were present. The doings of the Convention were very significant, and, as representing the opinions and drift of a numerous educated and industrious body of men, were worth noting. We can only glance at some of the more prominent features of the "Council."

The formal reception of Gov. Andrews, of Mass., was one of its doings; the members of the Council all rising to receive him. He it was who presided at the Unitarian Convention in New York, that scene of ribald blasphemy and heathenism. He of course made a speech, in which he said, "In a common purpose, with a common hope, encouraged by the expectation of good in this life and the promise of supernal good in that which is to come, let us devote ourselves, with one heart and one mind, towards the realization of the highest hopes of humanity, towards the perfection of all that which distinguishes and characterizes us as a free people, that which inspires the song of angels, and adds to the beatitude of heaven." (Loud applause.)

The attempt to adopt a "Declaration of Faith," developed some curious facts respecting Congregationalism at the present day. It was made manifest, in a long and excited discussion, that the great mass of Congregationalists do not really believe anything positive, or if they do, they do not know and cannot tell what it is. The Rev. Dr. Bacon said, "As a Council we agree 'in substance of doctrine,' and



it is our duty to say what we believe. But he protested against imposing a Confession of Faith, or setting it up as an idol, which is contrary to the second commandment. No Confession we can make can bind any body." Rev. Mr. Allen, of Mass., said, "There was one element of the Congregational Faith which a large portion of the Church regarded as a cardinal doctrine;—*there were others who believed it to be cardinally false. He referred to the doctrine of Original Sin.* He had long studied this point of faith, and he was prepared to take a stand against it and discuss it historically on a broader platform than this."

At last, something was adopted which was called a "Declaration of Faith." It is a long, adroitly written rhapsody of loose generalities, purposely signifying nothing. A leading article of that "Declaration" runs as follows: "Standing by the Rock where the Pilgrims set foot upon these shores, upon the spot where they worshipped God, and among the graves of the early generations, we, elders and messengers of the Congregational Churches of the United States, in National Council assembled—*like them acknowledging no rule of Faith but the Word of God—do now declare our adherence to the Faith and Order of the apostolic and primitive churches, held by our fathers and substantially embodied in the confessions and platforms which our synods of 1648 and 1680 set forth or reaffirmed.*"

On the subject of Congregational Polity, the Council was as much at loggerheads as in the matter of the Faith. Finally, Prof. Park, of Andover, who belongs to the very newest School of the "New Christianity," offered the following, which was adopted:—"Resolved, That this Council recognizes as distinctive of the Congregational Polity—first, that the local church derives its power and authority directly from Christ, and *is not subjected to any ecclesiastical government exterior or superior to itself.* Second, that each church is bound to observe the duties of mutual respect and charity, which are included in the communion of churches one with another, and that every church which refuses to give an orderly account of its proceedings when desired, violates the law of Christ. Third, that the functions of the ministry imply no power of governing, and that ministers not elected to office in any church have no official power in or over the churches."

The theological dishonesty which so often sneaks behind the stereotyped phrase "substance of doctrine," was boldly denounced by one of the speakers, but he only fought against the wind. On the whole, we have in the results of this Council, the real status of that noisy system, which a few of our own clergy are trying to engraft upon the Church. It is a Christianity without Christ; a boasted Humanitarianism without the power to be what it aims at. It scoffs at Creeds, and yet Creeds are the forms of life.

A funny feature of this Convention, if anything so serious can be funny, does not for obvious reasons appear on its records. This was a Protest from the openly pronounced Unitarians of that region. It was signed by three of the Unitarian ministers of Boston, as a committee of the "Ministerial Conference"—Rev. Dr. Gannett, Rev. Dr. Cyrus A. Bartol, and Rev. George E. Ellis. They complain that the members of their Conference, although Congregational, have not been invited to this National Council. They say that their churches are among the oldest Congregational Churches in the country; and they object to the exclusion, and to the monopoly of the name, Congregational, by the orthodox party. They say: "If we are not Congregationalists, we can not hold seats in the Massachusetts Convention, nor in the Congregational Charitable Society, in the impartial distribution of whose charities we have gladly given counsel and coöperation; nor can those who may, by our death, be left in necessitous circumstances receive aid from the funds of either of those bodies. If this name does not belong to us, the question may be raised whether funds now held in virtue of bequests to some of the churches or religious societies with which we are connected, for the support of the ministry or for parochial relief, can be lawfully retained." They therefore give notice that they shall claim and hold the name and rights of Congregationalists.

#### CONGREGATIONALISM IN CONNECTICUT.

A Congregationalist in Connecticut, under date of February 17th, writes as follows:—"In looking over the minutes of the General Association of Connecticut, held in 1865, we find that one-fifth of all the pastors in the



State were dismissed during the year, and that only eleven young men were ordained; that the salaries paid to thirty-three pastors, was \$500; nine pastors, \$400; one, \$300 and another, \$200; three, no salary; one hundred and four, \$1000; forty, \$1,500; sixteen, \$2,000; four, \$2,500; and three, \$3,000. The average sum paid to ministers in Fairfield county, was \$1,044; Hartford county, \$1,060; Litchfield county, \$880; Middlesex County, \$819; New Haven county, \$1,127; New London county, \$848; Tolland county, \$728; Windham county, \$653. There are now over seventy churches in this State who have neither pastors nor stated preachers."

#### GROWTH OF ROMANISM IN MASSACHUSETTS.

At a Funeral Sermon, in memory of the late Romish Bishop Fitzpatrick, the preacher said: "When he took charge of the Diocese of Boston, in 1846, there were only forty-five priests and thirty-eight churches in the four States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Massachusetts. Now, in the State of Massachusetts alone, they count 109 churches and 116 priests, whilst the number of priests in the original diocese amounts now to 168, and that of the churches to 190."

Concerning the Romanists of Boston, there is this to be said. They believe in their own system enough to labor for its extension, and are not perpetually striving to see how much of sympathy they can extend to other and hostile organizations.

#### DECLINE OF SECTS IN THE UNITED STATES.

**LUTHERANS ON THE DECREASE.**—The Lutheran Almanac for 1865 gives the following grand total:—Ministers, 1,543; congregations, 2,765; communicants, 292,723. The Almanac for 1866 gives—Ministers, 1,523; congregations, 2,632; communicants, 286,233; or a decrease of 20 ministers, 133 congregations, and 6,450 communicants.

**BAPTISTS IN NEW YORK ON THE DECREASE.**—The time has come, says the New York *Examiner*, when the Baptists in New York State are making no numerical progress. In 1792 we had 79 churches, with 4,895 members; in 1812, 274 churches and 19,242 members; in 1832, 605 churches and 60,006 members; in 1852, 813 churches and 85,923 members. We have since then advanced to nearly 100,000 members, but have declined again to a little less than 90,000.

**METHODISTS IN NEW ENGLAND ON THE DECREASE, AND NOT REALLY GAINING ANYWHERE.**—According to the figures in the *Traveller*, there has been a falling off in the membership of the six New England Conferences, during the last three years, to the number of 860.

The *Methodist* (newspaper) of Jan. 27, 1866, contains some remarkable statements. It says: In Bangor, in 1844, we had one strong church with 371 members. In 1864, two weak ones with 456—a gain of 85 only, for the twenty years. Portland does a little better; in 1844 having 650 members, and 1864, 904—a gain of 254; though it has about doubled its population. Portsmouth, N. H., in 1844 had one church with 310 members; in 1864 still but one church with 332—a gain of 22 for the 20 years. In Boston, though the population of the city has very largely increased, and our churches there have the advantage of immigration from all the other New England congregations, as the tendency of population in New England is to the metropolis, and the large manufacturing towns and cities, our gain has been from eight churches with 1,972, to ten churches with 2,550 members—a gain of 578 only. In Providence, Fall River, Taunton and New Bedford, we have done rather better, but in the flourishing little cities of New London and Norwich we have met with losses, and in the latter city they have been lamentably heavy.

In New York, in 1844 there were 10,474 members, in 1864 11,121—a gain of 647, enough only to make two decent city churches, though the population of the city has trebled. Baltimore, in 1844 shows 12,402 members; in 1864, 12,737—a gain of 335 only, for the twenty years. Albany, the capital of the great empire State, in 1844 had 1,434 members; in 1864, 1,613—a gain of 179 for the twenty years. Buffalo, one of the greatest entrepôts of the immense grain trade on this

continent, shows 681 in 1864, against 480 in 1844—a gain of 201, though I think the population of the city has about doubled in this time.

Even Cincinnati, the Queen City of the West, once so famous for its Methodism, though the seat of our Western Book Depository, with its immense business, the seat of a Wesleyan Female College, and the residence of a Bishop, in 1864 shows but 3,658, against 2,855 in 1844—a gain of but 803, and this gain mostly consists of the three German churches with 681 members. The gain in the English congregations for the twenty years is but little more than nominal.

From the General Conference of 1860 to that of 1864, we lost 50,000 members; and this year, as the result of the labors of 10,000 churches, of 15,000 travelling and local preachers, of 100 schools of learning, of our numerous and powerful presses in all parts of our wide country, and of the expenditure of \$626,000 of missionary money, our whole work in all parts of the world shows an increase of less than 1,000 souls. From the immense amount of probationers which we report from year to year, we find that our actual gain amounts to but about one fifth, or twenty per cent. of the whole number. Thus, among our converts, apostacy is still the rule and perseverance the exception, as it has ever been in all ages of the Christian Church. We yet show a powerfully aggressive force, but sadly lack the conservative. Ours is the most *awakening* ministry on earth, but we sadly fail in the power of *culture*, by which alone the fruits of our labor can be conserved.

**PRESBYTERIANS IN WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA ON THE DECREASE.**—At a meeting of the Presbytery of Blairsville, held Nov. 7th, the statement was made "that we have six hundred less communicants in the bounds of the Synod of Pittsburgh than we had six years ago! Many, too, who are in the Church, are a burden and a curse to the body, because they are wanting in love and every Christian grace."

#### RECEIPTS OF THE NEW YORK THEATRES, FOR THE LAST SEASON.

There are in New York City twelve theatres, (including the Museum and the Academy,) six Minstrel or Concert halls, two Circus and Menageries—and the receipts of these places of amusement for the past season, beginning with July, 1864, and ending with June, 1865, amounted to \$1,896,051. Counting in the money taken at the doors of the dozen minor shows and occasional amusements, the amount of money paid by the public for "Amusement" the last "Theatrical year" was probably two millions of dollars.

This sum was distributed—(as shown by the returns made at the Internal Revenue office, which claims two per cent. of the gross amount taken in at every theatre, opera, circus, museum, or other place of theatrical, operatic, acrobatic, or musical exhibition opened for the public)—among the following places of resort:

Barnum's Museum .....	July, 1864, to June, 1865 .....	280,342
Niblo's Garden .....	July, 1864, to June, 1865 .....	263,735
Wallack's Theatre .....	July, 1864, to July, 1865 .....	201,433
Olympic Theatre .....	Aug., 1864, to June, 1865 .....	159,347
Winter Garden .....	Aug., 1864, to July, 1865 .....	147,502
Broadway Theatre .....	July, 1864, to June, 1865 .....	124,684
Stadt Theatre .....	Sept., 1864, to June, 1865 .....	105,471
Bowery (old) Theatre .....	Aug., 1864, to June, 1865 .....	92,983
Bowery (new) Theatre .....	Sept., 1864, to May, 1865 .....	90,878
Academy of Music .....	Oct., 1864, to Feb., 1865 .....	87,222
Hippodiatron .....	Oct., 1864, to July, 1865 .....	82,646
Bryant's Minstrels .....	July, 1864, to July, 1865 .....	54,600
American Theatre .....	July, 1864, to July, 1865 .....	51,573
Wood's Minstrels .....	July, 1864, to May, 1865 .....	39,641
Campbell & Hooley's Minstrels .....	July, 1864, to May, 1865 .....	35,955
Van Amburgh's Menagerie .....	Oct., 1864, to Feb., 1865 .....	33,484
San Francisco Minstrels .....	May and June, 1865 .....	14,970
Heller's .....	Sept., 1864, to Feb., 1865 .....	12,436
French Theatre .....	Oct., 1864, to Mar., 1865 .....	9,872
Varieties Theatre .....	Feb., 1865, to June, 1865 .....	7,277

## SLAVES AND SLAVEHOLDERS IN 1860.

The following tables from the report of the census for 1860, showing the number of slaveholders and slaves in the Southern States in 1860, will be valuable for preservation :

<i>States.</i>	<i>Slaveholders.</i>	<i>Slaves.</i>
Alabama .....	33,730	435,080
Arkansas .....	1,149	111,115
Delaware .....	577	1,798
Florida .....	5,152	61,745
Georgia .....	41,082	462,198
Kansas .....	2	2
Kentucky .....	38,645	225,483
Louisiana .....	22,033	331,726
Maryland .....	13,783	87,189
Mississippi .....	30,943	436,631
Missouri .....	24,320	114,931
North Carolina .....	34,658	331,059
South Carolina .....	26,701	402,406
Tennessee .....	36,844	275,719
Texas .....	21,870	182,500
Virginia .....	52,128	490,855
Total .....	383,637	3,750,513
<i>Territories.</i>		
District of Columbia .....	1,229	3,185
Nebraska .....	6	15
Utah .....	12	29
Total .....	1,247	3,229
Total States and Territories .....	384,884	*3,953,742

The total number of slaveholders in 1850 was 347,525, increase in 1860, 37,259.

## ROMANISM IN MEXICO.

The Emperor Maximilian has issued a proclamation confirming and ratifying the sales of Church property; a large amount of which the Bishops had managed to get into their own hands, by arts which they so well understood. He has also issued a Decree as follows, granting religious toleration:—

Article 1. The empire protects the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion as the religion of the State.

Art 2. All forms of worship not contrary to morality, civilization and good manners, shall have free and ample toleration in all the territory of the Empire. No worship can be established without the previous consent of the Government.

Art. 3. As circumstances shall demand, the administration, by police regulations, will arrange all that may concern the exercise of worship.

Art. 4. Abuses which may be committed by the authorities against the exercise of worship and against the liberty which the laws guarantee to their ministers, shall be laid before the Council of State.

This decree shall be placed in the archives of the Empire and published in the official journal.

MAXIMILIAN.

To all this the Archbishops have replied, in the form of an Address to the Emperor, in which they express the "profound affliction" of the Mexican Church at the attacks made upon it by the Juarez Government, and the fond hopes which the accession of Maximilian and the arrival of the Papal Nuncio aroused. They say: "whatever may be the power, rank and position of those who exercise supreme

\*Exclusive of eighteen colored apprentices for life, (in the State of New Jersey), by the act to abolish slavery, passed April 18, 1846.

authority in the State, they have absolutely no power whatever over these matters; for it is only the visible head of the Church—that is the Pope—who can exercise this jurisdiction; it is only this power that binds and unbinds consciences; it is only this authority that is competent to proclaim dogmas of faith, to enlighten belief, to rule over morals, to decide doubtful questions, and to order all conflicts to cease by means of its sovereign declarations.

\* \* \* "With regard to religious tolerance, we can see nothing that renders it, not to say urgent, but even excusable."

---

## SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

### ENGLAND.

The Rt. Rev. JOHN GRAHAM, D. D., Bishop of Chester, after a brief illness, died June 15th, 1865, aged 71 years. He was a son of JOHN GRAHAM, Esq., of Durham, and was born in 1794. In 1834 he was appointed Prebendary of Lincoln. He was formerly Rector of Willingham, Cambridgeshire, and was one of the chaplains of his late Royal Highness, Prince Albert. He was consecrated to the Bishopric of Chester in 1848, and was patron of 47 livings. The annual value of his See is £4,500.

He had consecrated 78 new Churches in his Diocese.

The Queen has issued her *Conge d'Elire* to the Dean and Chapter of Chester, directing the election of Dr. Jacobson to the vacant see. The appointment is due to the influence of Mr. Gladstone. The Rev. Dr. Jacobson is Canon of Christ Church and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. His early theological training was amongst the Dissenters. He was a student at Homerton College and a pupil of Dr. Pye Smith, but he has become a very decided Churchman.

### BISHOP OF RUPERT'S LAND.

The Rev. ROBERT MACHRAY, D. D., was consecrated for this See on Saturday morning, June 24th, 1865, in the chapel of Lambeth Palace. The officiating Bishops were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Ely, and Brisbane, and Bishop Anderson, late Bishop of Rupert's Land.

### BISHOP OF NELSON.

The Rev. Andrew Burn Suter, M. A., has been nominated to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the See of Nelson, in New Zealand, by Bishop Hobhouse. He was formerly incumbent of All Saints Church, Spitalfields. His jurisdiction will extend over the northern part of the middle island of New Zealand to the 43d degree—a space which includes some 15,000,000 of acres. The income of the See is £500 from the Colonial Bishopric Fund, to which the Colonists make some small addition. The See of Victoria (Hong Kong), which was resigned by Dr. Smith some time back, still remains vacant as does also that of Grafton and Armidale, which has been formed in New South Wales.

A new See has been erected in New Zealand, called Dunedin, and embracing the provinces of Otago and Southland, heretofore in the Diocese of Christ Church. The gold diggings have attracted a great population. The Archbishop of Canterbury, acting at the request of the Primate of New Zealand, has appointed as its first Bishop, the Rev. H. L. Jenner, Vicar of Prestoncum-Wingham, in Kent, who is a thorough Churchman, and an accomplished Church musician. He has already been consecrated.

## CONVOCATION : PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

The Convocation of this province met in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Friday, Feb. 2, for Service and a Sermon, *which was in Latin*, and on the following Tuesday for business. In the Upper House, the Archbishop of Canterbury presided, and there were present, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Oxford, St. Asaph, Lincoln, Bangor, Salisbury, Peterborough, Gloucester and Bristol, Rochester and Llandaff. In the Lower House there was a full attendance. In the Upper House the Bishop of London presented a petition, numerously signed—so numerously signed, indeed, that it was hardly possible for any single person to lift the petition from the floor, on which it rested, to the table—praying their lordships to use their influence in discouraging the observance of obsolete customs, such as peculiar vestments, incense, &c., in the performance of Divine service. The petition was signed exclusively by laymen.

The Bishop of Oxford begged to move, as a matter of form, that the petition just presented do lie on the table. He did so in order to enable him to mention that he had received a petition on the same subject from Bachelors of Arts and undergraduates of the University of Oxford, who intended to offer themselves for Holy Orders. They represented that they had heard, with great regret, that certain changes in the rubrics, which materially affected the Ritual of the Church of England, were likely to be advocated in Parliament, by certain eminent members of the Legislature.

In the Lower House, after much debate, the following motion was passed:

"That this House, recognizing the evils which may arise from an excess of ritualism, deprecates, nevertheless, any attempt to avert those possible evils by the introduction of changes in the Prayer Book; that in coming to these resolutions the House by no means intend to express approval of any alteration from Church Order not included in the expression 'excess of ritualism;' that this resolution (the first paragraph) be communicated to their Lordships of the Upper House, with an humble request that they would take the matter into their consideration, and adopt such measures as they shall see fit, in conjunction with the House, for clearing the doubts and allaying the anxiety that exist upon it."

In the Upper House the Archbishop of Canterbury then put the resolution as follows:—

"That this House concurs with the Lower House in the Address presented by it; and that, with a view to granting its request, the Lower House be directed to inquire, by a Committee, as to such measures as may seem to them suitable for clearing the doubts and allaying the anxieties to which the Address alludes, and to communicate to this House such report, and also the judgment of the Lower House upon it."

The resolution was carried *nem. dis.*

Whereupon in the Lower House the Prolocutor appointed the committee as follows:—The Deans of Canterbury, Westminster, and Ely; Archdeacons Grant, Wordsworth, Denison, Freeman, and Randell, Chancellor Massingberd, the Rev. A. Oxenden, Canon Pilkington, Canon Woodgate, Dr. Jebb, the Rev. J. R. Woodford, Dr. Leighton, the Rev. J. W. Joyce, and Canon Seymour.

The Prolocutor also, by the direction of the Archbishop, reappointed the Russo-Greek Committee, adding to it Dr. Fraser and Canon Hawkins.

Convocation was prorogued to the 1st of May.

## CONVOCATION : PROVINCE OF YORK.

The Convocation of the Northern Province assembled in the Cathedral of York, and was opened by the Archbishop of York. Of the Upper House, there were present the President, Bishop Thomson, the Bishop of Ripon, Bickersteth, and the Bishop of Chester, Graham. After the separate organization of the two Houses, the members of the Upper House took their seats in the Lower House. In the Lower House the Dean of York was elected Prolocutor. On taking his place he said they met for discussion and deliberation for the first time on the opening of a new Parliament after 225 years. It was now 225 years since this House of Convocation

met for discussion and deliberation on the opening of a new Parliament. Seven years ago, and on previous occasions, they met simply to separate, but when they now met Convocation was a fact and a reality, and they were, under the advice and command of the Sovereign, able to meet for discussion and for the promotion, as they believed, of the best interests of their fellow-creatures.

The most important matters brought before Convocation were as follows:

The passing by the Convocation of Canterbury of certain alterations in the 29th Canon.

The Prolocutor offered the following motion, which was passed. "That with a view to securing the harmonious action of the Convocation of the two English provinces, it be agreed that no measure requiring the assent of the Crown ought to be transmitted by either Convocation to the Ministers of the Crown until it shall have been first considered and agreed to by both Convocations."

Numerous petitions were presented against any alterations in the Book of Common Prayer. Rev. J. Bell made the statement, "It might be within the knowledge of many members of this House, that the late Mr. Wesley, some years before he died, printed and published a revised Book of Common Prayer. That revision, he believed, contained almost all the parts of the Book of Common Prayer against which exception was taken now, and he might say, without fear of contradiction, that that Prayer Book was not now used in half-a-dozen chapels in England, and he could not help thinking that if any alteration were to take place, it would not be the means of bringing over to the Church any great number of the dissenting body, who, he believed, dissented not so much from the doctrines of the Church, but to show an independent spirit."

Archdeacon Churton gave notice of a motion:—"That the position and status of curates and unbeneficed clergy in the Church of England, which leaves them liable to a judicial sentence in matters of doctrine and practice, without the legal trial to which all beneficed clergy are entitled, is anomalous in itself, discouraging to all voluntary service on the part of the younger clergy, and calls for some more legal definite protection."

This led to a warm discussion as it involved the case of the Bishop of Manchester and the Rev. Mr. Nihill of St. Alban's. The motion was withdrawn, but in the debate Archdeacon Churton made the following statement: "He referred to Bishop Poyne's testimony showing that in the primitive Church adoration was paid to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and surely this prelate could not be accused of leaning towards Romish tendencies. He also read an extract from a work published by Archdeacon Freeman, proving that these high sacramental doctrines and practices had always been held as sound by the Church. The work of Archdeacon Freeman had never been called in question, and it was well-known by most scholars. Some years ago Mr. Freeman was appointed an archdeacon in the diocese of Exeter."

Archdeacon Churton's statement is a very loose one. Whether even it is true, depends upon what is meant by "the Primitive Church."

In respect to the condition of affairs in South Africa, the following motion was adopted, "That we, the Bishops and Clergy of the province of York, in Convocation under her Majesty's most royal writ of summons lawfully assembled, do hereby agree to pray his Grace, the Archbishop of York, as President of this Synod, and Primate of England and Metropolitan, to convey to the Lord Bishop of Capetown, and through him to the others, Bishops and clergy in the Church in South Africa, the expression of their deep sympathy in the heavy trial and perplexity which has befallen them, first in the denial, by a Bishop of that Province, of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, as received and held by the United Church of England and Ireland in common with the whole Church of Christ; and secondly, in the great difficulties attendant on the correction of the painful scandal and danger thus accruing to the Church in these lands. And they further pray his grace to add to this expression of their sympathy, the assurance of their prayers that the Holy Spirit of God may give to their brethren in South Africa, in their present difficulties, such courage, wisdom, and sound judgment as may enable them both to vindicate the faith committed to their care, and to recover the peace and unity so essential to the spiritual health and edification of their own flocks, as well as for the further propagation of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ among the heathen."



## CONVOCATION IN IRELAND.

The Archbishop of Dublin, who, we are glad to say, is a very different man and Churchman from his predecessor, made another attempt on July 4th, 1865, to obtain from Government and the House of Lords some acknowledgments of the right of the Irish Church to a Convocation; but Earl Granville repeated the refusal of Government to allow the Irish Convocation to meet to consider the propriety of repealing or altering the 16th Irish, which is nearly identical with the 29th English, Canon. It is much to be regretted that a privilege conceded to the English should thus be denied to the Irish Church, and it appears as if the two churches, under the Act of Union, were not after all really placed on the same footing. The Irish Clergy feel that they have been unfairly dealt with, and that a slight has been put upon them. They are consoled, however, by the knowledge that the sympathy of their English brethren is with them, and they hope to obtain from the next Parliament what has been so ungraciously withheld from them by the late one.

## DR. COLENZO: HISTORICAL STATEMENT AND THE PRINCIPLES INVOLVED.

As the case of Dr. Colenso is likely to settle some questions of the greatest importance to the well-being and future progress of the Reformed Church of England, we will attempt a brief statement of the facts up to the present time.

On Monday, March 20th, 1865, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, gave decision upon the appeal of Dr. Colenso from the decree of Bishop Grey of Capetown and Metropolitan, deposing him from his office of Bishop of Natal. All the Judicial Committee who heard the arguments were present—viz., the Lord Chancellor, Lord Cranworth, Lord Kingsdown, Dr. Lushington, and the Master of the Rolls. The judgment was, that "the proceedings taken by the Bishop of Capetown and the judgment or sentence pronounced by him against the Bishop of Natal, are null and void in law." This decision, the judges attempted to sustain by a long argument, which reads rather like a piece of special pleading than like a calm and impartial decree. By their own showing, the Letters Patent constituting Dr. Gray Bishop of Capetown and Metropolitan, and the Letters Patent constituting Dr. Colenso Bishop of Natal, *do* clothe the Metropolitan with the very power which he has exercised; but they seek to evade the force of this, by assuming that "these several Letters Patent were not granted in pursuance of any orders or order made by Her Majesty in Council, nor were they made by virtue of any statute of the Imperial Parliament, nor were they confirmed by any Act of the Legislature of the Cape of Good Hope or of the Legislative Council of Natal."

This decision, however, is proving a good deal more than Dr. Colenso and his friends anticipated. If the Royal Patent did not make the Bishop of Capetown a Metropolitan, simply because the Church of England, as a State institution, does not extend to the Colonies; so, for the same reason, the Royal Patent did not make Dr. Colenso Bishop of Natal; and he of course is left without a See. "The Church of South Africa, then, is free; and this freedom is far better than a temporal jurisdiction created by the State. \* \* \* The South African Church will have to organize itself, as the Scotch Church and the Church in the United States had to do before them. And as the Church in the United States rose from the dust in which it had been trampled, and flourished, as it did not when under the patronage of the State, so by God's help will the African."

Meanwhile, the Church at South Africa was not idle. On the 18th of January, 1865, the Third Synod of the Diocese of Capetown commenced its Sessions, when the Bishop delivered a Charge, in which he prepared the Church for the already anticipated decision of the Privy Council. In respect to the Royal Supremacy, he shows that one object of the Reformation was to destroy the appellate authority of the Pope. He says: "the personal will and conscience of the Sovereign has, in our day, lost its place in determining causes relating to the Church; and it does not inspire confidence to know that the most vital questions are liable to be decided by judges not one of whom need be even a Christian, much less a member of the Church; the selection of the judges, too, who are to try a particular case, resting, as it is understood, with the President of the Council for the time being.



In respect to the ancient Church, he shows that the primitive "Church had a very definite line by which she yielded full obedience to the temporal Sovereign, without giving up to them the trust committed to her."

"It is not lawful for me," writes the Emperor Theodosius, "not of the list of the most holy Bishops, to mingle in ecclesiastical questions." "It is not lawful," says the elder Valentinian, "for me, whose place is among the laity, to busy myself with matters of faith." When the Arian Bishop Auxentius, for whom Valentinian the younger wished to extort one of the churches of Milan, proposed to dispute with St. Ambrose before the Emperor and "selected Judges," the Emperor convened St. Ambrose before him by a tribune, requiring him to choose judges. The dispute was to be in the Emperor's Consistory, the Emperor to arbitrate. St. Ambrose declined, assigning as his reason, that in matters of faith where ecclesiastical persons were concerned, the judges should be both competent by office and qualified by profession; in other words, Bishops ought to be judged by Bishops. Who can deny, he adds, but that in matters of faith Bishops judge even Christian Emperors, so far are they from being judged by them? The Emperor Honorius declared that "if anything was to be determined between prelates in matters of religion, the judgment ought to have been Episcopal." The language of the Emperor Basil is—"I say it is not permitted to any layman whatsoever in any manner to move questions as to ecclesiastical subjects."

Mr. Justice Watermeyer has quoted in court here the law of Valentinian II., Theodosius and Arcadius in the Theodosian Code. "Questions of the Christian religion ought to be litigated before that judge who is the chief (Præsul) of all the the priests in those parts." And has pointed out that Justinian forbade the cognisance of such causes on the part of secular tribunals (Nov. 83, C. I.) "If the offence be ecclesiastical, needing ecclesiastical chastisement and penalty, let the Bishop give decree; the judge of the province by no means mixing in the cause. For we will that the civil judges shall have no cognisance of such things, since it is meet that they should be ecclesiastically examined." And, again, "If the cause be purely ecclesiastical, let the civil judge have no connection with such inquiry, but let the Bishop finally decide;" and again, "Ecclesiastical causes shall be heard only by the Bishops, or Metropolitans, or the Synods, or the Patriarchs."

Such were the powers lodged in or claimed by the emperors of the primitive Church, or those who acted under them, which our canons declare to be the measure of the power belonging to the Crown in our day. After citing other precedents, he says, In accordance with this says Mr. Gladstone,—"It was a fundamental idea of the Reformation, that the spirituality was the proper instrument, according to the Constitution, for the administration of Church affairs;" and again, "It was an understood principle and a regular usage of the Constitution that ecclesiastical laws should be administered by ecclesiastical judges." These were the securities on which the Church relied. He thus states the real issue: This—"that a lay court, composed I know not how, or of whom, it may be of men of any religion or of no religion, summoned and selected by a Minister of the day, shall claim the right to send back, possibly in consequence of some informality or technicality, one condemned by the formal decision of the Church here, and the voice of the Church everywhere, of greater and more numerous heresies than have ever been imputed to a Bishop of the Church before—to rule over a portion of the Church—to ordain whom he will to its ministry—to witness against that faith which once he upheld. Were I to acquiesce in such an act, or the rightfulness of such a claim, how could I answer before that Lord, the custody of whose Church in this land has been chiefly committed unto me—but whose cause and truth I should have betrayed—in the Judgment Day? At any cost or hazard, this Church must be kept clear of all complicity with deadly heresy. It must not allow the wolf to devour the flock—false teachers in its name and with its authority to occupy its highest posts; it must, let who will gainsay, and let the consequences be what they may, openly and unflinchingly confess Christ before men. As the Church acted during the Arian heresy, so must we now, if called to do so. "They are wont to say," says St. Jerome, "the Emperor communicates with us—actest thou against the Emperor? Despisest thou the Emperor's mandate?" They obeyed God rather than man in a matter wherein the faith was at stake, and we, I trust, are prepared to do the same."

Dr. Colenso now determined to return to his former Diocese, Natal. On the 27th of August, 1865, he sailed in the *Verulam*. Before leaving England, a private fund was raised for his benefit, amounting to £3,300, or over \$16,000. Among the contributors, were the Dean of Westminster (Stanley)! Dr. Temple of Rugby, the Astronomer Royal; Mr. George Grote, Mr. F. W. Newman. Sir John Bowring, Mr. Babbage, Lord Amberley, Lord Belper, the Rev. W. Rogers, of Bishopsgate; Sir J. Emerson Tennent, Sir B. Brodie, Bart.; Mr. Darwin, Mr. C. Dickens, &c.

Yet out of the whole number of contributors, comprising such avowed infidels as Newman! and Darwin! there were only about *forty* clergymen. It should be noted, also, that Dr. Colenso has already commenced a suit in Chancery, to recover his salary from the "Colonial Bishopric's Fund." To help him prosecute that suit, his friends have contributed to a fund; and among the subscribers are Dr. Hinds, the ex-Bishop of Norwich; the Deans of Westminster and St. Paul's; Dr. Temple, of Rugby; the Revs. W. Rogers, Rector of Bishopsgate; S. Hansard, Rector of Bethnal-green; and Professor Jowett.

To show what sort of a Christian Missionary Dr. Colenso is, before leaving England, he read a long paper at the Anthropological Society in defence of Christian Missions; but he defends them on the ground of their civilizing rather than Christianizing influence, and complains of the attempts made to indoctrinate the heathen with the principles of the fall of man, the inspiration of the Scriptures, and the necessity of faith in Christ unto salvation. Mr. Windwood Reade considered that this was the only good missionary address he had ever heard. Dr. Livingstone replied very convincingly, though somewhat contemptuously, to the statements made by Mr. Reade and Captain Burton, at the meeting of the London Missionary Society.

Dr. Colenso reached Natal November 6th. The clergy of his former Diocese had already formally given their allegiance to the Metropolitan in the following action, and also repudiating Dr. Colenso as their Bishop:

At a meeting of the clergy (commonly known as the clergy of the Church of England in Natal) held at St. John's Church, Pine-town, in the county of Durban, colony of Natal, on the 31st of May, 1865—present the Very Rev. the Dean of Pieter Maritzburg (presiding), the Ven. Archdeacon Fearn, the Revs. Canon Callaway, W. H. C. Lloyd, F. S. Robinson, J. Barker, W. O. Newnham, J. Walton, W. A. Elder, W. Baugh, and J. J. F. Neville Rolfe; present also, J. W. Turnbull, registrar,—it was (1) resolved that—

As at a meeting in the Palace of Lambeth, in the year of our Lord God 1853, of many Bishops of England and of her Majesty's colonies, presided over by the Most Rev. the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, it was resolved that the Churches in South Africa should be governed by the Bishop, commonly called Bishop of Capetown, as Metropolitan; and, further, as her Majesty the Queen, moved by pious zeal for the glory of God and extension of the Church of Christ, did, in letters patent dated December, 1853, declare her royal desire that the Bishop, commonly called Bishop of Capetown, should be Metropolitan Bishop over the Bishops, Clergy, and laity of the Churches in South Africa: and further, as by the late judgment of the Privy Council, the legal coercive powers supposed to have been conferred by the said letters patent are declared to be null and void: and further, as the spiritual power of the Bishop of Capetown, as Metropolitan, is in no ways affected by such judgment;—

We, whose names are hereunto subscribed, being Priests and Deacons of the Holy Catholic Church ministering in the colony of Natal (commonly called Priests and Deacons of the English Church, or of the United Church of England and Ireland), in order to give validity in her Majesty's courts to the pious intention of her most gracious Majesty the Queen, and for the purpose of testifying to the Right Rev. the Bishop our consent to, and acceptance of, the Metropolitan government of the Bishop of Capetown, do, by these presents, declare and make known that we have received, and do receive, the most reverend father in God, Robert Gray, D.D., commonly called Bishop of Capetown, as our Metropolitan, and do and will render to him obedience in the same degree and after the same manner as the Priests and Deacons of the Church of England, in the ecclesiastical province of Canterbury, in the king-

dom of England, are bound to obey the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, until such time as in a Provincial Synod the organization of the Church in South Africa shall have been settled, and such organization be approved and confirmed by the Lord Archbishop of the province of Canterbury.

James Green, M.A., Dean; Thomas Gleadow Fearn, Archdeacon of Durban; Henry Callaway, M.D., Canon; William A. Elder, Rector St. Thomas, Verulam; James Walton, Rector St. John's, Pine-town; W. O. Newnham, M.A.; Jos. Barker, Rector, Umzinto; Frederic Sydney Robinson, M.A., Priest; Walter Baugh, Missionary, Umlazi; John James Fawcett Neville Rolfe, Deacon, Curate of Bell Air.

2. Resolved—

That the Very Rev. the Dean communicate the above resolution to the Most Rev. the Metropolitan, and to the Lords Archbishops of the United Church of England and Ireland.

3. Resolved—

That the following declaration of the Clergy and lay members of the Church in Natal, whose names are hereunto subscribed, made in the cathedral Church of Pieter Maritzburg on the 19th May, 1864, when assembled in conference with the Most Rev. the Metropolitan, together with such other signatures as have been this day appended, be transmitted to the Lords Archbishops of the United Church of England and Ireland.

*Declaration.*

We, the undersigned, Clergy and lay members of the Church of England, being satisfied that Dr. Colenso has widely departed from the faith of the Church, and that he has been righteously deprived of his office by the Metropolitan, hereby declare our fixed resolve that we will no longer acknowledge him as our Bishop.

James Green, M.A., Dean; Thos. G. Fearn, Archdeacon of Durban; Henry Callaway, M.D., Canon; W. J. Newnham, M.A.; W. A. Elder, Rector of Verulam; James Walton, Rector of Pine-town; R. Robinson, Priest; Walter Braugh, Missionary, Umlazi; Joseph Barker, Missionary, Umzinto; Alfred W. L. Rivett, Acting Colonial Chaplain, and Incumbent of Addington; J. W. Turnbull, Samuel Williams, Churchwardens of St. Peter's Cathedral Church; G. H. Wathen, Treasurer of the Finance Board of the Diocese; G. M. McLeod, Churchwarden of Byrne; Henry Pinson, James Raw, Churchwardens of St. Andrew's; John Charles Earl, Churchwarden of Christ Church, Addington, Pieter Maritzburg, 19th May, 1864; Frederic Sydney Robinson, M.A., Priest; John James Fawcett Neville Rolfe, Deacon, Pine-town, 31st May, 1865.

On Dr. Colenso's arrival, the Dean of Maritzburg and the Churchwardens protested against his use of the Church, but Dr. Colenso applied to the Supreme Court, and obtained an interdict, by which the Dean and Churchwardens were compelled to open the Church on Nov. 17, to Dr. Colenso, at the usual hours. Full Services however were held at other hours by the Clergy. At Dr. Colenso's Service the scene was a most painful one. Of regular attendants few were present. The crowd had the aspect almost of a mob. A Mr. Tenneson, a Dane, is the only Clergyman who adheres to him. The Clergy of the Diocese have again protested against his attempted exercise of Episcopal functions, as follows:—

*"To John William Colenso, D.D., by Letters Patent designated Lord Bishop of Natal.*

"We, the undersigned, understanding from your letter dated London, 9th of June, 1865, addressed to the Clergy and Laity of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Diocese of Natal, that, on your arrival in the Colony, you propose to assume Episcopal authority over the body of Christians therein commonly called by that name, and to which we belong, beg to state that we cannot recognize your claim to exercise such authority, or to interfere in any wise with our Clergy, ourselves, or the property of the Church. Her Majesty's Privy Council has judicially decided on your petition that we are in the Colonies of the Crown in South Africa a voluntary association only, in the eyes of the law, and that it rests with ourselves

to make and execute our own rules, provided only that in so doing we do not anything contrary to the law of the land. The Crown, however, in Letters Patent granted to our Bishops, marked out a course which, seeking the well-being of the Church, it desired us to follow. That course has been loyally followed by the Bishops of Capetown, Grahamstown, St. Helena, and the Orange Free State, and they have deposed you, on account of your teaching, from the exercise of your spiritual office, by a sentence in which we concur. That sentence has also been manifestly accepted by the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, to whom we look with the greatest reverence and affection.

"This being the case, we must regard any attempt on your part to act in opposition to the judgment of the Church, expressed so frequently, so distinctly, and in such various ways, as an act interfering with those liberties as a voluntary association, and those rights as loyal subjects of the Crown, so distinctly secured to us by the Privy Council.

J. Green, M.A., Dean; J. G. Fearn, M.A., Archdeacon of Durban; F. S. Robinson, M.A., Priest; C. H. Dickinson; S. Williams; P. Paterson; C. H. Jenkyns."

At last, the Bishop of Capetown, Metropolitan, has addressed to Dr. Colenso the following final letter:—

Bishopscourt, Dec. 13, 1865.

My Lord,—The time has, alas, arrived, when, in accordance with the following resolution unanimously adopted by the Synod of Bishops of this Province, I am bound, after due and repeated admonition, to separate you by formal sentence from the Communion of the Church:—

"This Synod is of opinion that, should the Bishop of Natal presume to exercise Episcopal functions in the Diocese of Natal, after the sentence of the Metropolitan shall have been notified to him, without an appeal to Canterbury, and without being restored to his office by the Metropolitan, he will be *ipso facto* excommunicate: and that it will be the duty of the Metropolitan, after due admonition, to pronounce the formal sentence of excommunication."

Before taking this last step, thus enjoined upon me, which I am sure you will do me the justice to believe must be on every ground a most painful one, I desire to express my readiness to adopt any of the following courses, which, if assented to by you, may enable me to escape it:—

I will submit both the judgment and the sentence which I have pronounced upon the charges brought against you, and which have been agreed to by the other Bishops of this Province, for final adjudication either

I. To his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be heard by him, with the assistance of such Bishops of his Province, as he may see fit to summon.

I put this prominently forward, because it seems to have been the course decided upon by the Crown and the Church, at the foundation of the See, and marked out in the Letters Patent.

Or, II. To a Synod, or other gathering of the Bishops of England; or of the United Church.

Or, I. I. To a Synod, or other gathering, of such of the Bishops of our Communion throughout the empire, as can be assembled in London, for the hearing of the case, upon the invitation of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

And I will use earnest endeavors to obtain a hearing of the case at the earliest possible period by which ever tribunal you may prefer.

I cannot consent to submit my sentence to any other body, except the Bishops of the Church:—

I. Because I believe that they are the only persons who, by the Word of God and the Canons of the Church, are competent to set it aside.

II. Because it is expressly provided in the Letters Patent founding the several Sees of this Province, that the gravest Spiritual causes in this portion of the Church shall be finally decided by Bishops only.

III. Because there is no law, either of the Church or of the State, which empowers Her Majesty, either in person or by deputy, to hear and decide spiritual causes for Colonial Churches, which are declared to be purely voluntary religious associations.

Should you, within a week from the receipt of this letter, signify your readiness to the Dean of Maritzburg to abide by the decision of any parties whom I have named, he will stay the issue of the sentence. But if not, he will, under my instructions, publish without further reference to me the last sad formal document.

I remain, with the deepest pain and sorrow,

Your faithful servant,

(Signed)

R. CAPETOWN, Metropolitan.

**EXCOMMUNICATION OF DR. COLENZO.**—At last, as a fitting termination of these painful and mortifying scenes, but one which reflects the highest honour on the English Church, we record the following formal excommunication of Dr. Colenso, which took place on Sunday, the 5th of January.

At the Cathedral of Maritzburg, at the early service, the Dean read out the sentence as follows:—

"In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ: We, Robert, by Divine permission, Metropolitan of the Church in the Province of Capetown, in accordance with the decision of the Bishops of the Province in Synod assembled, do hereby, it being our office and our brief to do so, by the authority of Christ committed unto us, pass upon John William Colenso, D.D., the sentence of the greater excommunication, thereby separating him from the Communion of the Church of Christ so long as he shall obstinately and impenitently persist in his heresy, and claim to exercise the office of a Bishop within the Province of Capetown. And we do hereby make known to the faithful in Christ, that, being thus excluded from all Communion with the Church, he is, according to our Lord's command, and in conformity with the provisions of the 33rd of the Articles of Religion, 'to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as a heathen man and publican.'—(Matt. xviii. 17, 18.)

"Given under our hand and seal, this sixteenth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five.

" R. CAPETOWN."

This unhappy affair has called forth several public papers of great value and importance. These we cannot give, for want of space. Among these, is an Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and another to the Metropolitan of South Africa, from the Provincial Synod of Canada, at its Sessions at Montreal, Sept. 13th–20th, 1865. Their Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, opens up a new subject, of which we hope to hear more by and by.—"That in view of the recent decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the cases of the *Essays and Reviews*, and of the Bishops of Capetown and Natal—decisions calculated to call in doubt the authenticity of the historical books of the Bible and the doctrine of Future Punishment—his Grace, in order to comfort the souls of the faithful, would be pleased to call a General Synod of the Bishops of the Anglican Church, to be attended by presbyters and laymen learned in ecclesiastical lore, to take such measures as might best provide for the present distress; and that the Synod be presided over by his Grace."

Among these papers, are Letters from the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Dean of Maritzburg, and to Dr. Colenso. In the former he writes,—"I do not see how you can accept Dr. Colenso as your Bishop, without identifying yourselves with his errors. \* \* As to the appointment of a Bishop, the Church in South Africa has been pronounced, by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to be just as independent as any of the non-conformist communities; and under this view is, I conclude, competent to elect its own Bishop without reference to the authorities in England, either civil or ecclesiastical." In the latter, he says: "I have no hesitation in avowing that, according to my belief, you have been duly and canonically deposed from your spiritual office, and I must decline to hold myself responsible to you for entertaining such a belief. I have never obtruded this opinion upon others in my capacity as Primate; but I have not hesitated to avow my private opinion when it has been sought for. \* \* No one can more deeply deplore than I do the present unhappy condition of the Diocese of Natal; but let God be the judge with whom rests the responsibility of this lamentable division in a regularly constituted branch of the Church of Christ."

Another of these papers is the response of the Bishop of Capetown to the action

taken by the American Church, at her late General Convention; which action, in the form of a Resolution, was communicated to the Bishop of Capetown by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Whittingham. This letter is so valuable that we append it in full:

"Right Rev. Dr. WHITTINGHAM, Lord Bishop of Maryland.

"MY DEAR LORD AND BROTHER,—May I request that you will allow me to convey, through you, to the House of Bishops, and to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, the very sincere and grateful acknowledgments of the Bishops, and I feel I may add of the Church generally, in this Province, for the resolution which you inform me they have unanimously adopted in the fullest form of synodical action known to your Church.

"I should rejoice, under any circumstances, in the interchange of brotherly intercourse with the Church of a great people, one in faith with ourselves. I rejoice infinitely more that the first communication from your Church, which has taken such deep root, and extended itself so widely on the continent of America, to this feeble Church in South Africa, which is but of yesterday, should convey to it a recognition on your part of its endeavor to maintain the faith once delivered in its purity and integrity, and an encouragement to it to persevere in its resolution to witness truly to Christ amidst whatever trials and dangers such witness may entail.

"May the great Head of the Church strengthen each one of its branches in all lands wherein He has planted it, to make the preservation of His faith, which He has entrusted to its keeping, its chief care; and in order to this, may He vouchsafe a still larger measure of His Holy Spirit to them all.

"It will not, I trust, be regarded as unbecoming, if on this occasion, I venture to express my heartfelt thankfulness to God, in that He has healed the breaches of His people and restored brotherly concord and unity between the estranged branches of the one Church in the north and south of America. I pray God that your Church, renewed in vigour, may go forth in the strength of its Lord, and win to Him, and to the true faith, all who in your vast continent are sunk in ignorance, misbelief, or sin. It has for years been a cherished hope of mine that the Churches of England and America may one day meet together for common counsel and for the settlement of important questions which their ever-extending missions render it desirable to decide.

"Our own peculiar trials and difficulties are not over. The return of Dr. Colenso to Natal has, indeed, added to them. That we may carry on our sad and painful conflict in the spirit of meekness and charity, and, at the same time, with unflinching determination to preserve, at whatever cost or sacrifice, the faith and teaching of the Church incorrupt, will be, I am assured, the fervent wish and prayer of our brethren in a far distant land, who have comforted us with their counsel and encouragement.

"I remain, my dear Lord and brother, your faithful servant in Christ,

"R. CAPE TOWN."

#### THE COLONIAL BISHOPRICS.

It is understood that the Bishoprics of Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Nova Scotia, Jamaica, Antigua, Barbadoes, and Guiana are recognized by Act of Parliament, and are not affected by the Colenso judgment. The Bishoprics in Canada may also be upheld, although the Bishop of Montreal's claims as Metropolitan under an illegal patent are clearly void. In Colombo, Mauritius, Melbourne, Newcastle, Newfoundland, Sydney, and Tasmania, the salaries of the Bishops are paid wholly or in part from the Colonial Treasury, which may imply something like a recognition of their position by the State, although not of their jurisdiction. But as to the rest there is no such thing as a See of Fredericton, of British Columbia, of Nassau, of Capetown, of Grahamstown, of Natal, of Adelaide, of New Zealand, of Waiapu, of Wellington, of Nelson, and of Christ Church. On the other hand, the judgment does not touch Bishops in Crown colonies, and places not having a local Parliament; but it is at present uncertain what settlements legally and technically fall under that designation, and what is the exact value of the letters patent under which their Bishops act. Of these are probably the Dioceses of St. Helena, Sierra Leone, Victoria, La-



buan, Brisbane, Goulburn, and Perth. The Missionary Bishops of Honolulu, Central Africa, Melanesia, the Niger territory, and the Orange River, holding sees beyond the British possessions, never had any *status* or jurisdiction to lose, and, therefore, are not in any way affected by the recent judgment. It seems certain, then, that in at least twelve out of forty-one Dioceses, the Church has to be reconstructed *de novo*.

#### RITUAL OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY, on Saturday, Feb. 3d, received a numerous deputation at Lambeth Palace on the subject of the proposed alterations in the Book of Common Prayer respecting the ornaments of the Church and the mode of performing Divine Service. The Earl of Carnarvon introduced the deputation. The following Memorial was presented:

"To his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan.

"We, the undersigned lay communicants of the Church of England, respectfully object to any alteration being made in the Book of Common Prayer respecting the 'ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof,' and the mode and manner of performing Divine Service, according to the use of the Church of England."

Archdeacon Denison, the Hon. and Rev. R. Liddle, the Hon. Colin Lindsay, and others supported the Memorial, which was signed by 36,008 lay communicants, of which 24,133 were laymen, and 2,970 clergy of the Church of England.

We give the Archbishop's reply in full: "My lord, my reverend brethren, and Christian friends, I am happy to have been given to understand that though the address which you have just presented to me points to a single rubric only, it is intended to invite me to use my influence to prevent a revision of the Book of Common Prayer. Were I to encourage any attempt at a revision, I feel confident that I should be acting in opposition to the wishes of a very large majority of the clergy, as well as of our lay communicants; and with such a conviction you may believe that I have no inclination to take a step which would, in my opinion, be fraught with great danger to the Church. I have already publicly declared my determination never to consent to any alteration in any part of the Book of Common Prayer without the full concurrence of Convocation. The wording, however, of the address, would certainly have led me to suppose that those who supported it were ready to countenance the extreme ritualism that has been adopted in some few churches. In such a view, I certainly could not have concurred, for I cannot but feel that those who have violated a compromise and settlement which has existed for three hundred years, and are introducing vestments and ceremonies of a very doubtful legality, are really, though I am sure quite unconsciously, doing the work of the worst enemies of the Church. That settlement has been acquiesced in, as far as the vestments of the parochial clergy are concerned, by all the seven hundred prelates who have presided over the dioceses of England and Wales, from the early part of the reign of Elizabeth to this day. It is a settlement which such wise and holy men as Bishop Andrews, Richard Hooker, and their contemporaries were well content to leave untouched. A settlement which such a high ritualist as Bishop Cosins not only did not see reason to disturb, but even enforced on the parochial clergy of his diocese by the tenure of his visitation inquiries, and that in the face of the rubric then recently enacted as it stands in our present Prayer Book. From this the natural inference seems to be that he held the advertisements in the reign of Queen Elizabeth and the canons of 1603 to be nevertheless binding upon him. I confess I have witnessed with feelings of deep sorrow the tone of defiance with which the recently introduced practices have in some instances been supported. I fear that such advocates know not what spirit they are of, and I would fain hope that they may still learn to adopt something more of Christian moderation and Christian humility; that, with St. Paul, they may be ready to acknowledge that there are many things which may be lawful, and yet not expedient, and that they may be more ready to lend a willing ear to the pastoral and paternal counsels of those who are set over them in the Lord. Let it not be supposed that I have any sympathy with



those who would mutilate the services of the Church or slight its plain directions. My anxiety is to see that uniformity prevail in our public worship which it has been the especial object of the Reformed Church of England to secure. But hopeless indeed must be every prospect of uniformity if each clergyman is at liberty to reproduce, according to his individual caprice, "The Use of Salisbury, Hereford, Bangor, York, or Lincoln," which diversity is expressly depreciated in the preface to our Book of Common Prayer, as is also that "excessive multitude of ceremonies so great, and many of them so dark, that they did more confuse and darken than declare and set forth Christ's benefit unto us." You will all, I am sure, join with me in humble prayer to the Throne of Grace, that the spirit of wisdom and truth may be found abundantly in all orders and degrees of men in our Church, that so we may form a right judgment in this matter, and joyfully serve the Lord in all godly quietness and peace."

His Grace pronounced the Benediction, and with it the proceedings were brought to a close.

On Thursday, Feb. 1st, a deputation of a somewhat different character, consisting chiefly of Church dignitaries below the rank of Bishops, waited upon the Archbishop of Canterbury, at Lambeth Palace, for the purpose of presenting to him a memorial.

This deputation was introduced by Archdeacon Wordsworth. This Memorial was as follows:—

"We, the undersigned, clergymen of the United Churches of England and Ireland, resident in metropolitan parishes within the Dioceses of London and Winchester, respectfully address your Grace in reference to the recent introduction into the celebration of Divine Service of practices which, by their diversity and by their deviation from law and from long-established usage, are disturbing the peace and impairing the efficiency of the Church, and are disquieting the minds of many devout members of our communion. Without venturing to suggest any remedy for the evils of which we complain, we earnestly pray your Grace to devise such measures, in concert with your suffragans, as may be best calculated to repress such of the practices referred to as are illegal, and to secure that measure of uniformity in the celebration of Divine Service which is involved in the ideal of a National Church."

This memorial has received the signatures of 1 archdeacon, 6 canons residentiary, 14 rural deans, 9 prebendaries of St. Paul's, and 481 other clergy, of whom 220 are incumbents, 157 are curates, and 104 are chaplains, lecturers, diocesan home missionaries, secretaries of societies, and non-officiating clergy—in all 508. The memorial was issued only to the clergy of the dioceses of London and Winchester resident within the metropolitan postal district.

#### PROPOSED REVISION OF THE PRAYER BOOK.

On Thursday afternoon, Feb. 1, a deputation waited upon Earl Russell, at his official residence in Downing-street, for the purpose of submitting to him a memorial from the president, council, and members of the Association for Promoting a Revision of the Prayer Book, and for securing purity and simplicity in the public worship of the Church of England. There were present, Lord Ebury, the Marquis Westmeath, Lord Falkland, Lord Thomas Cecil, the Hon. and Rev. E. V. Blich, the Rev. Dr. Jacobs, head master of Christ's Hospital; the Rev. G. H. Stoddart, B.D.; the Rev. Peter Jones, M.A., curate of St. Clement Danes; the Rev. Prebendary Burgess, the Rev. Dr. Fry, and between fifty and sixty other gentlemen.

Lord Ebury introduced the deputation, and the Rev. R. Bingham, M.A., incumbent of Queenborough, read the following memorial:—

"That your memorialists venture to submit that the disorders which are now prevalent in many parishes, call loudly for the interference of her Majesty's Government, with a view to the removal of the occasions of contention, and they humbly think that the most successful agency for that purpose would be found in a Royal Commission, constituted as was that which had to consider the terms of clerical subscription, and which in a short space of time suggested a satisfactory remedy

for a crying evil. To this new commission, in the opinion of your memorialists, should be referred, not only the lectionary and the rubrics, but also the canons and constitutions and occasional services; for action being now inevitable, it would be a cause for regret should the force of it become expended upon minor subjects, such as vestments, or candlesticks, or some peculiar systems of ritual and ministrations, while passing by matters more essential to the peace and stability of the Church. That a few verbal alterations, or the omission of a few phrases in the occasional services, which would in no way contravene any article of our faith, would, your memorialists confidently affirm, decrease very much the immense amount of non-conformity now existent in this realm as well as give ease to the consciences within the Church's pale. That your memorialists would further draw attention to the fact that several members of the right rev. bench have admitted the necessity of amendment, at least in respect of the lectionary, the burial service, and the rubrics; and therefore, they venture to suggest how opportune the present moment is for the interposition of Government, while they earnestly entreat your lordship to advise her Majesty to appoint another Royal Commission for the aforesaid purposes, in order that in due time the report may be laid before Parliament."

In his reply, the Earl Russell said, "when they came to ask him for alterations in the Liturgy, he was bound to say that he was not prepared to give any opinion on it. It must be obvious that if this concession were granted, there was another party in the Church who would ask for and expect alterations in a different direction, and who would ask for some alteration in the Articles, so as to make them more in accordance with their own opinions. He should deprecate any disruption in the Church of England, and would do his best to counteract any tendency in that direction."

#### UNION OF THE ENGLISH AND RUSSO-GREEK CHURCHES.

On the 15th of November last, a meeting was held at the rooms of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Pall-Mall, London, to consider the subject of union with the Eastern Churches. An account of that meeting was given, in a letter from the Russian Prince Orloff, in the Moscow *Gazette*, and translated from that paper by the Berlin correspondent of the London *Times*. His letter is dated at Belfontaine, near Fontainebleau, November 28, 1865. He says:

I promised to inform you of what occurred at the London meeting on the 15th inst. The meeting was attended by about eighty persons, chiefly clergymen of High Church principles. Of the many eminent gentlemen present, I will only mention the Bishop of Oxford, who presided, the Bishop of Lincoln the Bishop Coadjutor of Edinburgh, Drs. Pusey and Liddon of Oxford; Dr. Williams of Cambridge; and Mr. Wordsworth, the Dean (?) of Westminster. The Russians present were, Father Yevgeni Popoff, our worthy chaplain in London; Count Alexei Tolstoi, and myself. The meeting was private. After reading the resolution of last year's meeting, purporting "that the doctrine of the Eastern Church should be examined with a view to mitigating the estrangement of the various Christian Churches from each other," the Bishop of Oxford desired me to say a few words. Having premised that I was speaking in a private capacity, I said that the Russian clergy, praying daily for the establishment of a common Christian Church, would be always inclined to promote it. In proof of this, I alleged that the study of the English language had been introduced into our ecclesiastical academies, and that our clergy would be prepared to sift privately all disputed points. I added, however, that the most holy Philaret, the Archbishop of Moscow, and lofty patriarch of our Church, was of opinion that this was a grave and difficult question, which ought to be slowly matured, and above all, investigated, closely and minutely. In conclusion, I moved, (1.) That works should be published in England, setting forth the history, doctrine, and present condition of the Anglican Church, with a view to proving that it is not a Protestant [!] but a Catholic Church, and, accordingly, related to the Eastern Church. I also remarked that the subject being altogether unknown to the Russian public, it ought to be explained fully and copiously. (2.) That Anglican clergymen sympathizing with the cause should be stationed at Moscow and St. Petersburg. (3.) That the matter should not be precipitated, or urged with too

much eagerness or violence, but that we should trust in the Divine assistance rather than in the success of our human and short-sighted endeavors. What we had to do now was to prepare the ground by elucidating the question. The seed would grow up, and future generations, perhaps, would reap the harvest, if God willed it.

Father Popoff, who delivered an eloquent speech, breathing the spirit of Christianity, expressed himself to the same effect. After him some clergymen spoke of dogmatical points. I omit quoting their opinions; they will be probably communicated by Father Popoff in his report to the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod. They had no immediate reference to the matter in hand. Ten Bishops, two Archbishops, and some other gentlemen, among whom was Mr. Gladstone, who was staying at Windsor with the Queen, had sent letters sympathizing with our efforts. The Primus of Scotland observed in his letter, that in 1718 the Scotch and Orthodox Churches had been negotiating upon the subject, when their discussions were suddenly interrupted by the death of Peter the Great and the subsequent ascendancy of Lutheran influences in Russia. The Bishops of Oxford and Edinburgh urged that, in their opinion, we should not content ourselves with preparing the ground leaving the harvest to be reaped by future generations, but, deferring all dogmatical debates, proceed to celebrate the Lord's Supper by intercommunion, if such were the wish of the chiefs of our Church. Upon a gentleman remarking that Orthodox Christians might receive the communion in Anglican Churches even now, this was confirmed by the Bishops and Archbishops present, including the Primate of Canterbury. Another gentleman then stated that Englishmen were admitted to the communion in the Orthodox Churches of Servia. Before the close of the debates, I rose again to declare that the Russian Church being but one of the five branches of the Eastern Catholic Church, the matter was all the more complicated, and that the subordinate members of our clergy were not at liberty to decide any ecclesiastical questions, being entirely guided by the rules and directions of their Church. The Servian story, upon inquiry, proved a mere myth.

Prayers were offered up at the beginning and close of the meeting, which had a purely spiritual character. No resolutions were passed, but all agreed that the cause should be promoted cautiously, but incessantly.

The day after, I paid a visit to the Archbishop of Canterbury at his country seat. He would have liked to dispatch two Bishops to Russia, but, hearing what I had to say against his plan, put it off. The Bishop of Exeter, the nonagenarian patriarch of the Anglican Church, also speaks with great interest of the work of reunion. The matter has nothing whatever to do with politics; though, if a reunion were effected, the Russian and English interests in the East might possibly become identical.

PRINCE N. ORLOFF.

#### CHURCH IN NEW ZEALAND.

The Bishops of the Anglican Church in New Zealand have petitioned the Queen for leave to resign their letters patent. The gist of the matter is contained in the following paragraph.

2. That your Majesty's petitioners accepted letters-patent from the Crown, the validity of which has now been denied by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the following words:

Although in a Crown Colony properly so called . . . a Bishopric may be constituted and ecclesiastical jurisdiction conferred by the sole authority of the Crown, yet the letters patent of the Crown will not have any such effect or operation in a colony or settlement which is possessed of an independent Legislature. [*On Petition of the Bishop of Natal, March 20, 1865.*]

That the letters patent granted to your Majesty's petitioners were issued after the colony of New Zealand had become possessed of an independent Legislature.

They also state "that your Majesty's petitioners have accepted and acquiesce in the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that the Church of England in this colony "is in the same situation with any other religious body, in no better but in no worse position, and the members may adopt rules for enforcing

discipline within their body which will be binding on those who expressly, or by implication, have assented to them."

They then advert to the provision already made in the Colony by the Church, by which the ends of justice will be answered, and conclude as follows:

"That your Majesty's petitioners therefore humbly pray that all doubts may be removed as to their *status*, both ecclesiastical and temporal:

1. By the acceptance of the surrender of their letters patent, now declared to be null and void.

2. By declaring the royal mandate under which your Majesty's petitioners were consecrated, to be merely an authority given by the Crown for the act of consecration, and to have no further effect or legal consequence.

3. By recognizing the inherent right of the Bishops in New Zealand to fill up vacancies in their own order by the consecration of persons elected in conformity with the regulations of the General Synod, without letters patent, and without royal mandate, in the same manner as they have already consecrated a missionary Bishop for the Islands in the Western Pacific, after communication with your Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies and with the Attorney-General for New Zealand.

And your Majesty's humble and loyal petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c."

G. A. NEW ZEALAND,  
H. J. C. CHRISTCHURCH,

C. J. WELLINGTON,  
EDMUND NELSON,

WILLIAM WAIAPU.

We predict, that if the sympathizers with Colenzo, some of whom fill high places in the English Church at home, can find any way by which they can hamper the Church, and shield such unprincipled apostates, and still live on the Church's funds obtained only by perjury, they will not hesitate to do it.

#### DEATH OF LORD PALMERSTON.

This distinguished man, who, since the beginning of this century, has filled so conspicuous a place in the British Government, died Oct. 18th. Henry John Temple, third Viscount Palmerston, was born at Broadlands, near Romsey, Hampshire, October 20th, 1784, and as his death occurred Oct. 18th, 1865, he had nearly completed his 81st year. Although he made no profession of the Religion of Christ, yet, strange as it may seem to an American Churchman, the appointment of a large number of English Bishops was in his hands. The noted Earl Shaftsbury was his son-in-law. It appears from the following list of Lord Palmerston's ecclesiastical appointments, that in less than ten years of office his Lordship had at his disposal three English and two Irish Archbishoprics, besides sixteen English and four Irish Bishoprics; so that twenty-five mitres in all, and ten English Deaneries, were given away by Lord Palmerston:

*English Archbishoprics*:—Canterbury (1862) Dr. Longley; York (1860) Dr. Longley, (1862) Dr. Thomson.

*English Bishops*:—London (1856) Dean Tait; Durham (1856) Bishop Longley, (1860) Bishop Villiers, (1861) Bishop Baring; Carlisle (1855) Dr. Villiers (1860) Dr. Waldograve; Gloucester and Bristol (1856) Dr. Baring, (1861) Dr. Thompson, (1861) Dr. Ellicott; Ripon (1856) Dr. Bickersteth; Norwich (1857) Dr. Pelham; Rochester (1860) Dr. Wigram; Worcester (1860) Dr. Philpott; Ely, (1864) Dr. Harold Browne; Peterborough (1864) Dean Jeune; Chester (1864) Dr. Jacobson.

*Irish Archbishoprics*:—Armagh (1862) Dr. Beresford; Dublin (1863) Dean Trench.

*Irish Bishops*:—Cork (1857) Dr. Fitzgerald, (1862) Dr. J. Gregg; Killaloe (1862) Dr. Fitzgerald; Kilmore (1862) Dr. Verschoyle.

*English Deans*:—Westminster (1857) Dr. Trench, (1863) Dr. Stanley; Canterbury (1857) Dr. Alford; Ripon (1859) Dr. Garnier, (1860) Dr. Goode; Lincoln (1860) Dr. Garnier, (1864) Dr. Jeune, Dr. Jeremie; Gloucester (1862) Dr. Henry Law; Exeter (1862) Viscount Midleton.

Lord Palmerston, also, as Prime Minister, made the following appointments to important livings in the gift of the Crown:—The Rectory of St. Marylebone, Rev. C. P. Eyre. All Souls', Marylebone, Rev. Eardly Wilmot. Trinity Church,

Marylebone, Rev. W. Cadman. St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, Rev. C. D. Marston. The appointment of Canon Conway to the Rectory of St. Margaret's, Westminster, with the Canonry annexed, was one of the last of Lord Palmerston's important appointments. The very last was the appointment of Dr. Payne Smith to the Regius Professorship of Divinity at Oxford, with a Canonry of Christ Church annexed. Two years ago, in spite of powerful Neologian influence, he succeeded in placing Dr. Shirley in the Regius Professorship of Ecclesiastical History, with another Canonry of Christ Church at Oxford, to which Dr. Stanley had previously been removed from Canterbury.

#### GREAT CHANGES IN THE SCOTCH ESTABLISHMENT.

The Rev. Norman M'Leod, D. D., one of her Majesty's chaplains in Scotland, in a speech before his Presbytery, came out against the Lord's Day as of divine obligation, and gives up the authority of the whole Moral Law as supplemented by the Law of Christ in the New Testament. Principal Tulloch of St. Andrew's University, in an introductory lecture to the Theological students of the University, elaborately assailed the Formularies of the Church of Scotland, commonly called the Westminster Standards, as not up to the spirit of the age and times. The Rev. Dr. Lee, of Edinburgh, has introduced a Prayer Book and an organ into his place of worship. The Rev. Dr. Bisset, of Aberdeen, and the Rev. Dr. Hanna, biographer and son-in-law of Dr. Chalmers, it is said, are contemplating taking Orders in the Church of England. The *London Weekly Review* says:

"Altogether, poor times appear to be in store for the once energetic and popular Church of Scotland. At one period after another, especially in 1843, she lost a very large portion of her life-blood, and was immensely reduced in strength. She has also, of late years, been coldly supported or actually deserted by a large portion of the gentry and of the higher middle class. And now a party within herself, guided by some of her more clever and popular ministers, is undermining her creed and her worship, and threatening her constitution and very existence as a Presbyterian Church."

#### ANGLO CONTINENTAL SOCIETY.

A public meeting of this important society was held Feb. 22d, 1865, in London, the Bishop of Ely, President of the Society, in the Chair. Bishop Browne, in opening the proceedings, made an able address.

The Bishop of Oxford moved, "That the intercommunion of National Churches, reformed on the primitive model, offers the least hope of the Unity of Christendom."

The venerable Archdeacon Wordsworth, moved, "That the present state of Italy, presenting the prospect of a reformation of the National Church, calls for the sympathy of Englishmen, and especially of members of the English Church." His speech was the speech of the occasion; showing an intimate knowledge of the great movement now going on in the very heart of the Italian Church against the Bishop of Rome. Passaglia, the chosen champion of the doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception" in 1854, has collected 9000 signatures of priests in protest against the temporal power of the Papacy. The Pope will not accept the King's nominees to Bishoprics, and there are now more than fifty Sees vacant in Italy.

J. G. Hubbard, Esq., M. P., moved, "That it is highly desirable to promote a better understanding between the members of the English and the Eastern Churches."

Other resolutions were offered, and speeches made, and the Meeting was one of great interest.

#### ITALIAN CHURCH REFORMATION.

We find the following in the (London) *Guardian* of July 12, 1865:—

SIR,—Not having seen in the public papers any authentic notice of two great efforts, now being made by Italians themselves, both clergy and laity, to reform their own Church, or rather to *restore* it to its ancient condition in doctrine and dis-

cipline, I venture to communicate to the readers of the *Guardian* some particulars on this subject.

The first of these two movements has originated at Naples and in the south of Italy; and it has already led to the formation of a society called *Società Emancipatrice*, which numbers at present 971 priests and 852 laymen, among whom are three ex-Ministers, thirty-six members of Parliament, and eleven Senators.

This society has recently put forth a *Programma* or *Statuto* of its principles, in eight articles, dated Naples, 25th June, 1865. Those articles are as follows:—

1. The Pope, Bishop of Rome, is Primate of the Catholic Church; and an Ecumenical Council, presided over by the Pope, is supreme Judge in questions of faith.

2. All Bishops, Archbishops, and Metropolitans shall have restored to them all their rights and jurisdiction which they exercised until the beginning of the eleventh century.

3. The clergy and laity shall have a free voice in the election of Bishops, pastors of parishes, and of the Pope.

4. The liturgy of the Church shall be in the vernacular tongue; and the Holy Scriptures, translated into the Italian language, shall be freely circulated among the people.

5. Confession to a priest not to be enforced.

6. The clergy shall have restored to them a free voice in the deliberations of Diocesan and Provincial Synods.

7. Compulsory celibacy of the priesthood shall be abolished.

8. Full liberty of conscience shall be respected.

Another similar association has been formed in Tuscany, and has recently put forth its "programma," as follows:

1. The laity shall have restored to them the right of choosing their pastors, and of administering the temporal affairs of the Church.

2. The Bishops shall be chosen by the clergy and laity; saving the rights of the Crown.

3. The ancient rights of Bishops and Metropolitans shall be restored; and the present dependence of Bishops on Rome shall be abolished; and the oath which is now taken by Bishops to the Pope shall be prohibited.

4. Celibacy of the clergy shall not be obligatory.

5. The Holy Scriptures shall be freely circulated among the laity.

6. The liturgy shall be in the language understood by the people.

7. Confession to a priest shall be voluntary; and the Holy Communion shall be administered in both kinds.

I have not heard, as yet, the number of signatures affixed to this latter document: but I know that it has received the cordial approval of the greatest living statesman in Italy.

Such manifestos as these, together with the happy failure of Vegezzi's mission to the Pope, which might have resulted in another of those miserable compromises called *Concordats*,—betraying the ancient rights of Bishops, clergy, and people,—may well inspire the hearts of Churchmen in England with hopes of a new era for Italy, and may well encourage them to persevere in prayers and endeavors for such a blessed consummation.

W.

#### NEED OF MORE BISHOPS IN ENGLAND.

The Bishop of Norwich, in his second Septennial charge delivered to the Clergy in his Cathedral, June 19th, says, that during the last seven years, there had been 309 appointments to incumbencies in his Diocese, and 40 to curacies. He had examined 242 schools and held 39 meetings of the clergy. Eighty new parsonage houses had been provided; 242 churches had been either entirely or in great part restored; and 130 new schools had been built. The number of persons he had confirmed was 33,700, or about 4,800 per annum, and he had endeavored to increase the number of places at which the rite was administered. It would be his desire to visit every parish in the Diocese; but its extent was such that it would take twenty years to accomplish this. He had therefore selected 50 of the largest parishes, containing a third of the whole population, and in most of these had attempted something like a pastoral visitation, devoting Sunday and Monday to the



work. The holding of services during the week, as our Bishops do, thus reaching a much larger number of the churches, does not seem to have entered into his Lordship's view. But where there are 500 or more churches in a Diocese, it is no wonder that a Bishop should despair of reaching all.

#### RETURNING TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The second son of the Rev. Dr. Arnold, Mr. Thomas Arnold, who had been a Professor in Dr. Newman's Dublin University, has returned from his wandering to Popery, and conformed to the Church of England.

Mr. William Gifford Palgrave, of the Order of Jesuits, and a son of the late Sir Francis Palgrave, has lately seceded from the Roman Catholic Church. This gentleman was formerly a student at Oriel, and took a very excellent degree at the University. Being what was thought in those days an ultra-tractarian, he declined being ordained in the English Church, and went out to Bombay as a cadet in the Indian army, joining the Eighth Native Infantry. He served for five or six years in the East, and then left the army, becoming at the same time a Roman Catholic, and entering the Order of the Jesuits. He studied at Rome as well as in France, and after a long probation was ordained a priest of the Roman Catholic Church, and sent by his Order as a missionary to Syria, where he has labored with great zeal in the cause of his creed for ten or twelve years. Mr. or "Father" Palgrave, as he was then called, is perhaps the best living Arabic scholar, speaking, reading, and writing that language like a native. At Beyrout, and all over the Lebanon, he was known as the energetic opponent of the Protestant missionaries, preaching as he did in the native churches in the Arabic language, and always getting the best of the argument. He made a public recantation of the Roman Catholic creed at Berlin a few days ago, and has accepted an appointment to proceed to Bagdad as Prussian Consul General.

The returns to the English Church of perverts are becoming frequent. Of course there are those who have neither learning, good sense, or any conscience on the subject; and these Rome will still retain.

#### PROTESTANTISM IN FRANCE AND BELGIUM.

The "*Evangelical Christendom*," thus describes the condition of French Protestantism:—"It must be sorrowfully admitted that our Protestant Churches in France are passing through a crisis which is without a parallel in former times. During the reigns of Louis XIII., Louis XIV., and Louis XV., our fathers, the old Huguenots, had to struggle against the persecutions of the Romanists. They had sometimes to sacrifice their goods and persons. But they were at least united among themselves; they encouraged and strengthened one another; and if they suffered much, they had great strength and abundant consolation in their fraternal unity.

Now, our position is quite different. Our most active enemies are in our own bosom; they even fill the places of pastors; they are laboring to demolish our holy citadel, by allying themselves with Freethinkers, Deists, Pantheists, and even Atheists, as well as with republicans and demagogues. They are constantly invoking the great words liberty and progress, in order to secure the placing of every kind of doctrinal teaching upon the same level, and the irresponsibility or omnipotence of pastors. How are these attacks of a new kind to be surmounted? The question is a solemn one, and the future alone can answer it."

#### BELGIUM.

In Belgium, the Protestant National Church is divided on the same theological questions. One member of the Synod, while retaining his position, renounces "Orthodox Protestantism," publicly disclaiming his belief in the Trinity, in the Fall, in the Divine inspiration of the Scripture, in redemption through the blood of Christ, ("who died on the cross, because men tied him to it,") in other articles of faith, and in all miracles and mysteries.



## ROMANISM AND RATIONALISM IN OUR TIMES.

The following appears in one of the papers of the day. We give it without comment:

Germany, since the days of Moehler,—France under the new concordat and the teachings of such men as De Bonald and De Maistre,—and England, since the liberality of her political reform under the Ministry of Peel supported by Wellington, granting to Roman Catholics, in her Protestant realm, admission to civil offices,—have all become Papal beyond what they were in the age preceding. Spain, Portugal and Ireland, have shared in a similar fate, notwithstanding the revolutions that have occurred, the liberal spirit that has been abroad, and the partial, powerful movements of Protestants to the contrary. Under the Wisemans and Newmans of the Roman Catholic Church, England has received a new, a Papal hierarchy; and to-day her Puseyism, Romanism and Infidelity are ruling her with despotic sway. Both Protestant and Roman Catholic writers agree to announce the wonderful progress of Popery in the United States, under the banner and protection of our free institutions. Ultramontanism has bent its bow more tightly than ever. Protestantism, by its divisions, has become almost a "*Concordia Discors*," and the Atheism, Pantheism and Naturalism of Europe, transplanting themselves here, have begun already the work of devastating science, religion and practical life, and penetrating even to the lowest strata of society. The developments of both Popery and Infidelity in our own land show, with unmistakable accuracy, that at present we live in the midst of a yet undecided conflict—a conflict germinating more especially from the forces which, at the opening of this century, arrayed themselves under new forms of Anti-christianism on the one hand and old revived forms on the other, and which have not yet manifested themselves in the fullness of their strength here, as in other lands, but are energizing, every hour, with increasing and portentous determination. Many have been foolish enough to think that the spirit of the nineteenth century had at length overmastered the genius of Popery; but the encyclical of Pío Nono, like a clap of thunder from the Vatican, has disturbed the composure of their dream. It is nothing less than the declaration of war against all civil and religious liberty, a revival of the ideas of Gregory and Boniface, of Hildebrand and Innocent. Many, too, were amusing themselves with the vain speculation that Rationalism had been vanquished and driven to the wall, and compelled to hide its head, by the prestige and power of faith. But the sudden reprint of the works of Strauss, the issue of new books by the same author, the appearance of the works of Renan—infidel from the very bosom of Roman Catholicism,—and the bold front put on by the American imitators of foreign apostates, have dispelled the delusion.

## MORAVIAN FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Annual Report for 1864, gives the following statistics:

**LABRADOR.**—Stations, 4; 17 Missionaries and 15 Female Assistants, together 32 persons; National Assistants, 30; 4 Station Schools and 280 Scholars; 1,059 converts.

**GREENLAND.**—Stations, 6; 13 Missionaries and 8 Female Assistants, together 21 persons; National Assistants, 67 persons; 4 Station Schools with 187 scholars; 1,825 converts.

**NORTH AMERICAN INDIAN COUNTRY.**—Stations, 4; 4 Missionaries and 4 Female Assistants; 192 converts.

**DANISH WEST INDIES.**—Stations, 8; 9 Missionaries and 7 Female Assistants, together 16 persons; 1 Native Missionary; National Assistants, 130 persons; 7 Station Schools and 16 Country Schools; 3,020 scholars; 44 teachers; 61 monitors; 7,032 converts.

**BRITISH WEST INDIES.**—Stations, 31 in Jamaica, Antigua, St. Kitts, Barbados and Tabago; 38 Missionaries and 36 Female Assistants, together 74 persons; National Assistants, 591 persons; 2 Native Missionaries; 51 Station Schools and 50 Country Schools; 7,514 Scholars; 127 teachers; 501 monitors; 27,601 converts.

**MOSQUITO COAST.**—Stations, 6; 6 Missionaries and 6 Female Assistants, together 12 persons; 1 Native Missionary; 8 National Assistants; 5 Station and 1 Country School; 282 Scholars; 7 teachers; 629 converts.

**SURINAM.**—Stations, 12; 34 Missionaries and 33 Female Assistants, together 67 persons; 14 Schools; 2,084 Scholars; 24,777 converts.

**SOUTH AFRICA.**—Stations, 12; 32 Missionaries and 30 Female Assistants, together 62 persons; 2 Native Missionaries; 24 Schools; 2,160 Scholars; 8,890 converts.

**AUSTRALIA.**—Stations, 2; 3 Missionaries and 3 Female Assistants; 16 converts; 1 school; 14 Scholars.

**INTERIOR OF AUSTRALIA.**—Missionaries 4. This is a new Mission, and the Missionaries are engaged in exploring the country.

**WEST HIMALAYA.**—Stations, 2; 4 Missionaries and 4 Female Assistants; 1 School; 15 Scholars.

#### STATISTICAL SUMMARY.

**MISSIONS.**—Number of Missions, 15; number of Stations, 87; number of preaching places as given last year, 307.

**LABORERS.**—Number of Ordained Missionaries, 148; Number of Assistants not ordained, 16; Number of Female Assistants, 146; whole number of laborers sent out by the Church at Home, 306; number of ordained Native Missionaries, 4; Number of Unordained Native Missionaries, 6; Number of National Assistants, as far as reported, 458; number of Female National Assistants, as far as reported, 368; Whole number of Native Laborers, 825; whole number of Laborers, foreign and native, as far as reported, 1,142.

**EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.**—Number of Training Schools, 7; number of Station and Country Schools, 178; number of Sunday Schools, as far as reported, 90; whole number of Schools, 275; number of Pupils in Training Schools, 67; number of Pupils in Station and Country Schools, 15,556; number of Pupils in Sunday Schools, 13,110; whole number of Pupils, as far as reported, 28,733.

**THE PRESS.**—Number of Printing Establishments, 2; number of periodicals published, 3.

**THE CONVERTS.**—Number of Baptized Members, 32,666; number of Candidates, 15,538; whole number of Adult Converts, 48,204; number of Baptized Children, 23,819; whole number of persons under instruction, 72,033.

The whole number of converts is 4,350 less than at the time of the publication of the last annual report.

#### ROMAN CATHOLIC POPULATION IN THE WORLD.

The following statistics appear in a late number of the *New York Tablet*, a Romanish Newspaper. We do not place much reliance on these tables, but give them as a matter of curiosity:—

Recent statistical tables represent the entire Roman Catholic population as not exceeding 150 millions. Balbi had made it 137 millions in 1827. But both estimates are certainly below the truth. It may be rated, in round numbers, at 200 millions, although, if we follow official documents, including both civil and ecclesiastical enumerations, and the best data of modern geographers, we shall find an aggregate little short of 203 millions.

Europe has Roman Catholics, .....	147,194,000
Asia and Oceania, .....	9,666,000
Africa, .....	4,071,000
America, .....	46,970,000
Total, .....	207,901,000

It is curious, in connection with this matter, to study the progress of the Roman Catholic Church in the last quarter-century. For this purpose, we may best satisfy inquiry by giving the movement as it shows itself in two very decidedly Protestant countries, Great Britain and Holland. We subjoin an official statistic comprising England and Scotland.

The expenditure for the erection or repair of churches, for conventual buildings, hospitals, orphan asylums, and other charitable establishments, has been beyond all precedent since the ages of high religious fervor.

Year.	Priests.	Churches.	Communities— Male. Female.		Chapels.
1839,	610	513	0	17	10
1849,	897	612	13	41	10
1864,	1,445	1,098	56	186	12

To this we annex the Roman Catholic increase in the Low Countries in 50 years:

Year	Catholics.	Parishes.	Priests.	Churches.
1814,	850,000	814	1,216	898
1864,	1,300,000	941	1,726	976

But of all the countries which have participated in this remarkable "revival," the United States present the most honorable and glorifying results. If we compare the year 1808 with 1857, we shall find:—

Year.	Dioceses.	Apos. Vic.	Bishops.	Priests.
1808,	1	0	2	68
1857,	41	2	39	1,872

  

Year.	Churches.	Eccles. Est.	Colleges.	Convent Schools.
1808,	80	2	1	2
1857,	2,882	35	20	134

The number of missionary priests sent from Rome, amounted, in 1864, to 2,055.

Another authority, "*The Catholic World*," has the following:—

STATISTICS OF CATHOLICISM.—In the world there are over 200,000,000 Roman Catholics. There are 5,000,000 in the United States. The government of the Church in the United States, is divided into 43 Dioceses and 3 Vicariates-Apostolic, presided over by 45 Bishops,—the Diocese of Baltimore being the Metropolitan See. There are 3,795 churches, 2,317 clergymen, 49 ecclesiastical institutions, 29 colleges, 134 schools for girls. (In 1808, there were 2 Bishops, 80 churches, and 68 clergymen, and about 5 colleges.) There are over 66 asylums for orphans, 26 hospitals, with 3,000 beds, 4 insane asylums. (The latter part of the statistics are much below the real number.) There are in the Italian States 23,500,000 Roman Catholics; Spain, 17,000,000; France, 36,000,000; Great Britain, 7,500,000; China, 1,000,000; Austrian Empire, 30,000,000; Prussia, 7,000,000; Bavaria, 3,600,000. In the German States, 3,000,000; Poland, 400,000; Russia, 3,000,000; Turkey, 1,000,000; Mexico, 8,000,000; Brazil, 8,500,000; Canada, 1,560,000. The Roman Catholic population of Europe is 149,194,000; Asia, 9,666,000; Africa, 4,071,000; America, 47,970,000. There are over 2,000 missionaries, (490 of whom are Jesuits,) in foreign parts, from Italy alone, one half of whom are occupied in China, Japan, Corea, and India. They travel without money, and depend entirely for their support upon the natives. At least one-fifth of them meet with a violent death. In the District of Pekin alone there are 70,000 Catholics, notwithstanding constant persecution.

## EDITORIAL.

It is with no ordinary feelings that we congratulate our readers on entering upon the eighteenth Volume, and the nineteenth year, of the *American Quarterly Church Review*. It is now almost twenty years since, in company with the Rev. Jas. MacKay, afterwards of Scotland, and still later of India, we visited Hartford, Conn., to consult the late Rt. Rev. Bishop Brownell, the Rev. Dr. Jarvis, and other Clergy, respecting the plan of a *Quarterly Church Review*. What seemed a casual circumstance, first suggested the undertaking. Little did we then know of the care and labor which we were about to assume. We regarded such an experiment rather as an agreeable diversion from the graver duties of the Ministry, especially as aided by our friend, already accustomed to Editorial labor. Nor did we anticipate that it would, to such an extent, separate us from the active duties of a calling to which we were bound by every consideration of duty and feeling. Unexpected events almost at once threw the whole responsibility of the enterprise upon our hands. It had already been carried too far to be abandoned; and, at the special advice of our Bishop, we relinquished every other engagement for the purpose of establishing the Review and of doing the work of the Church through its pages. Its ceaseless drudgery, and perpetual annoyances, the thankless task of much of its labor, are often so irksome, that we long for the more congenial paths of a Pastor of Christ's flock, and we have been tempted again and again to seek such a relief.

Within this almost score of years, the Church has passed through at least two crises in her history; one doctrinal, the other growing out of civil and political events. She is now entering upon a period, as it seems to us, of the greatest possible promise, and of the most imminent peril; when her foundations are to be tried to the uttermost. Romanism, and Radicalism, and Rationalism, are contending for the mastery in this great Republic, with all their might. The course of the Review has been a plain one. At the very outset, a few simple rules, based upon fundamental principles, were adopted as our guide in the management of the work; from them we have never swerved; and they have been equal to our necessities. We shall not depart from them in future.

The Review has not been a labor in vain. Besides discussions of a more general character, the rescuing of King James' Version of the Bible from mutilation; the Free Church Movement; the return of the Church to the Primitive pattern in respect to Diocesan divisions and Episcopal jurisdiction; the Provincial System; the defense of an Apostolic Ministry from treachery; the attacks of Romanism and Rationalism; the new phases of Modern Infidelity, and especially the insidious assaults upon the Gospel by sciolists in Natural Science; Christian Nurture and Education; Church Unity; and last, but not least, Church Life and Church Work,—these are some of the points which have been fully discussed in the Review, and by some of the ablest writers in the Church. In regard to some of these themes, we have but just entered upon their examination. Almost everything is yet to be done before the Church is fully roused to a sense of their importance. Within the next decade, new duties, and new forms of conflict, are evidently in prospect. With the most wonderful opportunities of growth ever before the Church, she seems likely enough to be distracted and weakened by the madness of internal dissensions. Now, as at the first, while the watchmen are sleeping or quarrelling, the enemy are sowing tares. May God give us all wisdom, and strength, and boldness, to meet the issue, come how and when it may.

We publish, in this Number of the Review, the names of all the writers in the last nine volumes. If there is talent, learning, high literary culture, doctrinal soundness, and loyalty to sound Church principles within the Church, they are found in the list of names which we now give. Several other gentlemen, thoroughly furnished for such work, and in full sympathy with the Review, have promised contributions hereafter.

There is one feature of the Review steadily kept in mind, and, as we think, more and more developed in its course, to which we ask special attention. A *Quarterly Review*, in the estimation of most people, has come to be regarded as a synonym for heaviness and dullness, and as adapted only to the tastes and capacities of the Clergy, and professional scholars. Now, we propose that every Number of this Review shall have something in it which scholars will read with interest. Neither do we propose to cater to the appetites of morbid sentimentalists of either sex. Such persons will find what they seek in abundance elsewhere. But we do mean, distinctly, that the Review shall address, and engage the attention of thoughtful men and women in the Church, and shall do something, at least, to meet their wants, to

guide and fortify them as members of Christ's Church at such an age and in such a day as this. Romanists are spreading broad-cast their "Tracts for the People." Deists and Infidels are endowing Schools and Colleges, and Periodicals, to gain and control the public mind. Churchmen, in behalf of themselves, their families, their sons and their daughters, cannot afford to be indifferent to the movements and tendencies of the age and times. While we do not suppose that they are to become sensationalists or alarmists, for this not their mood, yet they must, and will, if they are true to themselves, keep an eye upon what is passing around them. Such persons will, we hope, find the Review the very thing that they need, and to be worthy of careful preservation.

We take pleasure in saying, that the Review enters upon a new Volume with a subscription list much larger than at any past period in its history. We publish already an addition of between four and five thousand copies, and we expect to extend the circulation. For this we rely upon the efficiency of our General Agent, the Rev. C. W. Homer, and upon the coöperation of the friends of the Review in all parts of the country. *We ask such interest in behalf of the work.* We believe the living, working Clergy will find it a valuable adjunct in their Parishes. At present prices it costs us nearly as much to publish the Review as we receive for it, so that we must insist on prompt payments, and, as far as convenient, strictly in advance.

---

NOTE.—In two Articles in this Number (Arts. IV. and VII.) different interpretations are given as to what it is *right* to sing, before and after Morning and Evening Prayer. Both writers are "masters in Israel," and we give the construction of each. The need of a Rubric on the subject is apparent.